

REMARKS

On several

Occasional Reflections:

In ANSWER to

The Rev. Dr. MIDDLETON, Dr. POCOCKE,
The MASTER of the Charter House,
Dr. RICHARD GREY, and others.

Serving to explain and justify divers PASSAGES
in the

DIVINE LEGATION,

Objected to by those LEARNED WRITERS.

To which is added,

A GENERAL REVIEW of the Argument
of the *Divine Legation*, as far as it is yet advanced:
wherein is considered the Relation the several
Parts bear to each other, and to the Whole.

Together with

AN APPENDIX

In answer to a late Pamphlet entitled,
An Examination of Mr. W—s second Proposition.

By Mr. WARBURTON.

LONDON,

Printed for JOHN and PAUL KNAPTON in
Ludgate Street. MDCCXLIV.

Quid immerentes hospites vexas, Canis,
Ignavus adversum Lupos?
Nam, qualis aut Molossus, aut fulvus Lacon,
AMICA VIS PASTORIBUS,
Agam per altas aure sublata nives,
Quæcunque præcedet Fera.
Tu quum timenda voce complesti Nemus,
Projectum odoraris CIBUM.

Hor.

P R E F A C E.

IN the Prefatory Discourse to the first Volume of the D. L. I spoke pretty largely of the *Use of Ridicule*, in religious Subjects; as the *Abuse* of it is amongst the fashionable Arts of Free-thinking: For which I have been just now call'd to Account, without any Ceremony, by the *Nameless* Author of a Poem intitled, *The Pleasures of Imagination*. For 'tis my Fortune to be still concern'd with those who either *do* go masked, or those who *should*. I am a plain Man, and on my first Appearance in this Way, I told my Name and who I belonged to. After this, if Men will *rudely* come upon me in Disguise, they can have no Reason to complain, that (in my Ignorance of their Characters) I treat them all alike upon the same free Footing they have put themselves.

. This Gentleman, a Follower of Ld. S. and, as it should seem, one of those to whom that Preface was address'd; Certainly, one of those to whom I applied the Words of Tully, *non decet, non datum est*; who affect Wit and

Raillery on Subjects not meet, and with Talents unequal ; this Gentleman, I say, in the 105th and 106th Pages of his Poem, animadverts upon me in the following Manner :

Since it is (says he) beyond all Contradiction evident, that we have a natural Sense or Feeling of the ridiculous, and since so good a Reason may be assigned to justify the supreme Being for bestowing it ; one cannot without Astonishment reflect on the Conduct of those Men who imagine it for the Service of true Religion to vilify and blacken it without Distinction, and endeavour to persuade us that it is never applied but in a bad Cause. The Reason here given, to shew, that *Ridicule* and *Buffoonry* may be properly employed on *serious* and even *sacred* Subjects, is admirable : it is, because we have a *natural Sense or Feeling of the ridiculous*, and because *no Sensation was given us in vain* ; which would serve just as well to excuse *Adultery* or *Incest*. For have we not as *natural a Sense or Feeling of the Voluptuous ?* And was it not given for as good Purposes ? But he will say, it has it's proper Objects. And does he think, I will not say the same of his *Sense of Ridicule ?* For he stretch'd a Point, when he told the Reader I *vilified and blacken'd it without Distinction.* The Thing I there oppos'd, was only, an *extravagant Disposition to unreasonable Mirth*².

P R E F A C E.

v

Mirth^a. The *abusive Way of Art and Raillery on serious Subjects*^b. With as little Truth could he say, that *I endeavour'd to persuade the Public that it is never applied but in a bad Cause*: For, in that very Place, I apologized for an eminent Writer who had applied it to a good one^c.

But, in the next Words, if he means by, *is not*, ought not to be, he gives me up all I want. *Ridicule* (says he) *is not concerned with mere speculative Truth or Falshood*. Certainly. And, for that very Reason I would exclude it from those Subjects. What need? he will say, For when was it so employed? Hold a little. Was it not concerned with *mere speculative Truth*, when his Master ridiculed the *Subject* of Mr. Locke's *Essay of Human Understanding*, in the Manner mentioned in my *Preface*^d? Was it not so concerned too, when the same Noble Person ridiculed Revelation, in the merry Story of the travelling Gentlemen, who put a *wrong Bias on their Reason* in order to believe right^e? — Unless, by *mere speculative Truths*, he means, Truths of *no Use*: And for all such, he has my free Leave to treat them as he pleases. He has shewn, by

^a P. x. third Edit.

^b P. xii.

^c P. vi. & seq.

^d Dedication to the 1st Vol. D. L. p. xxvi. Note (^b.)

^e Char. II. Vol. III. Misc. 2. c. 3. p. 99.

his

his Poem, they are no improper Subject for his Talents.

He goes on, *It is not in abstract Propositions or Theorems, but in Actions and Passions, Good and Evil, Beauty and Deformity, that we find Materials for it ; and all these Terms are relative, implying Approbation or Blame.* The Reason here given, why, not *abstract Propositions, &c.* but *Actions and Passions, &c.* are the Subject of *ridicule* is, because these latter are *relative Terms implying Approbation and Blame.* But are not the former as much *relative Terms, implying Assent and Denial?* And does not an absurd Proposition, as frequently afford Materials for Ridicule as an absurd Action? Let the Reader determine by what he finds before him. *To ask then, (says he) whether Ridicule be a Test of Truth, is, in other Words, to ask whether that which is ridiculous can be morally true ; can be just and becoming ; or whether that which is just and becoming can be ridiculous. A Question that does not deserve a serious Answer.* Why then did he put it? For it is of no body's asking but his own. However in Civility to his Master, or rather indeed to his Master's Masters, the Ancient *Sophists*, who, we are told * in the *Characteristics*, said something very like it, I shall shew it de-

* 'Twas the Saying of an Antient Sage, that Humour was the only Test of Ridicule. Vol. I. p. 74.

P R E F A C E. vii

serves a *very* serious Answer. For how, I pray, comes it to pass, that to ask *whether Ridicule be a Test of Truth, is the same Thing as to ask whether that which is ridiculous can be morally true?* As if, whatever *Ridicule* was applied to, as a *Test*, must needs be *ridiculous*. Might not one ask, *Whether the Copel* be a Test of Gold*, without incurring the Absurdity of questioning *whether the Matter of the Copel was not standard Gold?* What was the Man dreaming of? That a *Test of Truth*, and a *Detection of Falshood*, were one and the same Thing? or that it was the Practice to bring nothing to the *Test* but what was known, beforehand, whether it was *true* or *false*? His Master seems much better vers'd in the Use of Things. He says, † *Now, what Rule or Measure is there in the World, except in considering the real Temper of Things, to find which are truly serious, and which ridiculous? And how can this be done, unless by applying the Ridicule TO SEE WHETHER IT WILL BEAR?*

But if the Reader be curious to see to the Bottom of this Affair, we must go a little deeper. Lord S——, we find, was willing to

* I chuse this Instance of the Refiner's *Copel*, because the *English* for it, which is *Italian*, is *Test*; from whence the latter Word was metaphorically used to signify all Kinds of *sure Trial*. This was proper to observe as our Poet seems not to know the Meaning of the Word.

† Char. Vol. I. p. 12.

know,

know, as every honest Man would, whether those things, which had the Appearance of Seriousness and Sanctity, were indeed what they appeared. The plain way of coming to this Knowledge had been hitherto by the Test of *Reason*. But this was too long and too slow a Progress for so sublime a Genius. He would go a shorter and a quicker Way to work, and do the Business by *Ridicule*, given us, as his Disciple tells us, for this very End, *to aid the tardy Steps of Reason*. This therefore the Noble Author would needs *apply*, to see *whether these Appearances would bear the Touch*. Now it was this ingenious Expedient, which I thought I had Cause to object to. For when you have applied this *Touch*, and that, to which it is applied, is found to bear it, what Reparation will you make to Truth, for the ridiculous Light in which you have placed her, in order only, as you pretend, to judge right of her? Oh, for that, says his Lordship, she has the Amends in her own Hands: Let her railley again; *for why should fair Honesty be denied the Use of this Weapon**? To this so wanton a Liberty with sacred Truth, I thought I had many good Reasons to oppose; and so, it seems, thought our Poet likewise: And therefore he endeavours to excuse his Master, by putting another Sense on *the Application of Ridicule as a Test*, which supposes the Truth

* Charact. Vol. I. p. 128.

or Falshood of the Thing tried, to be *already known*. But the Shift is unlucky; for while it covers his Master, it exposes himself. For now it may be asked, what need of Ridicule at all, after the Truth is *known*; since you make its sole Use to consist in the *Discovery* of the true State of Things?

But the odd Fortune of our Poet's Pen makes the pleasant Part of the Story. Here, we see, where he aims to make an absurd Proposition, for the Use of others, it proves a reasonable one: 'Tis odds but we find him, before we have done, trying to make a reasonable one, for his own Use, that turns out at last an Absurdity.

But let us come to the *Philosophy* of his Criticism: FOR *it is most evident, that as in a metaphysical Proposition offered to the Understanding for its Assent, the Faculty of Reason examines the Terms of the Proposition; and finding one Idea, which was supposed equal to another, to be in Faët unequal, of Consequence rejects the Proposition as a Falshood: So in Objects offered to the Mind for its Esteem or Applause, the Faculty of Ridicule feeling an Incongruity in the Claim, urges the Mind to reject it with Laughter and Contempt.* And now, how does this sublime Account, of Reason and Ridicule, prove the foregoing Proposition to be absurd?

Just as much, I suppose, as the Height of St. Paul's proves Grantham Steeple to stand awry. I, for my Part, can collect nothing from it, unless it be that the Poet thought *metaphysical Propositions* were the only proper Objects of the *Understanding's Assent*, and the *Reason's Examination*.

However, if it cannot *prove* what preceeds, he will try to make it *infer* what follows: *When THEREFORE* (says he) *we observe such a Claim obtruded upon Mankind, and the inconsistent Circumstances carefully concealed from the Eye of the Public, it is our Business, if the Matter be of Importance to Society, to drag out those latent Circumstances, and, by setting them full in View, convince the World how ridiculous the Claim is; and thus a double Advantage is gained; for we both detect the moral Falshood sooner than in the Way of speculative Enquiry, and impress the Minds of Men with a stronger Sense of the Vanity and Error of its Authors. And this, and no more, is meant by the Application of Ridicule.* A little more, if we may believe his Master: who says, it is not only to detect Error, but to *try Truth*, that is, in his own Expression, to see *whether it will bear*. But why all this a-do; for now, we see, no Body mistook what was *meant by the Application of Ridicule*, but himself,

P R E F A C E. xi

self.—As to what he said before, that when *Objects are offered to the Mind for its Esteem and Applause, the Faculty of Ridicule, feeling an Incongruity in the Claim; urges the Mind to reject it with Laughter and Contempt*; it is so expressed, as if he intended it not for the Description of the *Use*, but the *Essence* of *Ridicule*. Whereas the Dealers in this Trash frequently *urge the Mind to reject* many things with *Laughter and Contempt*, without feeling any other *Incongruity*, than in their own Pretensions to Truth and Honesty. And this our Poet very well knows.

For now he comes to the Point. *But it is said the Practice is dangerous; and may be inconsistent with the Regard we owe to Objects of real Dignity and Excellence. I answer, the Practice, FAIRLY MANAGED, can never be dangerous.* An *Answer* which has only taught me to *reply*, that the Use of Stiletto's and Poisons, *fairly managed*, can never be dangerous. And yet all wise States, for the Security of its Members, when any of them have shewn a violent Propensity to these things, have ever forbidden their promiscuous Use and Sale.

However, he allows at length, that *Men may be dishonest in obtruding Circumstances foreign to the Object; and we may be inadvertent in allowing those Circumstances to impose upon*

us; but — but what? Why the SENSE OF RIDICULE ALWAYS JUDGES RIGHT. And, he had told us before, that this is a *natural Sense, and bestowed upon us by the supreme Being, to aid our tardy Steps in Pursuit of Reason.* Why, as he says, who can withstand this? Nothing can be clearer! Writers may be dishonest; Readers may be imposed on; the Public may be misled; and Men may judge wrong. But what then, the *Sense of Ridicule always judges right.* And while we can support our *Platonic Republic of Ideas*, what signifies what becomes of the *Fæces Romuli*, the *Actions* of the People. And so again it is, we see, in the Use of Poisons: Though *Men may be dishonest in obtruding them, and we may be inadvertent enough to suffer them to impose upon us; yet what then? The Efficacy of Poison is without Malice; and does but do its kind; is a natural Power, and bestowed upon us by the supreme Being, to aid our tardy Steps in Pursuit of Vermin.* — In Truth, one would imagine, by so extraordinary an Argument, that the Question was not, *of the Injury to Society by the Abuse of Ridicule, but of the Injury to Ridicule itself.*

But let us hear him out: *The Socrates of Aristophanes is as truly ridiculous a Character as*
ever

P R E F A C E. xiii

*ever was drawn. True; but it is not the Character of Socrates, the divine Moralist, and Father of ancient Wisdom. Indeed! — But then, if, like the true *Sofia*, in the other Comedy, he must bear the Blows of his fictitious Brother, what signifies it to injured Virtue, to tell us, that he did not deserve them?*

*What then? (says he) did the Ridicule of the Poet hinder the Philosopher from detecting and disclaiming those foreign Circumstances which he had falsely introduced into his Character, and thus rendering the Satirist doubly ridiculous in his Turn. See here again! all his Concern, we find, is, lest good Raillery should be beat at its own Weapons. No, indeed, I cannot see how it could possibly hinder the Philosopher from detecting and disclaiming. But this it did, which surely deserves a little Reflection, it hindered the People from seeing what he had detected and disclaimed — A mighty Consolation, truly, to expiring Virtue, that he disclaimed the Fool's Coat they had put upon him; though it stood to him like a *Sambenito*; and at last brought him to his Execution.*

But what is the Sacrifice of a *Socrates* now and then, to secure the free Use of that inestimable Blessing, *Buffoonry*? So thinks our Poet; when all the Answer he gives to so natural,

tural, so compassionate an Objection as this, *No: but it nevertheless had an ill Influence on the Minds of the People*, is telling us a Story of the Atheist *Spinoza*; while the Godlike *Socrates* is left neglected, and in the Hands of his Judges; whither *Ridicule*, this noble Guide of Truth, had safely brought him.

But let us hear the concluding Answer which the respectable *Spinoza* is employed to illustrate.—*And so (says he) has the Reasoning of Spinoza made many Atheists; he has founded it indeed on Suppositions utterly false; but allow him these, and his Conclusions are unavoidably true. And if we must reject the Use of Ridicule because, by the Imposition of false Circumstances, things may be made to seem ridiculous, which are not so in themselves; why we ought not in the same Manner to reject the Use of Reason, because, by proceeding on false Principles, Conclusions will appear true which are impossible in Nature, let the vehement and obstinate Declaimers against Ridicule determine.*

Nay, we dare trust it with any one; whose Common Sense is not all turned to *Tast*. What! because REASON, the Guide of Life, the Support of Religion, the Investigator of Truth, must be still used tho' it be continually Subject to Abuse; therefore RIDICULE, the poultry *Buffoon* of Reason, must have the same Indulgence!

Because

Because a King must be intrusted with Government, tho' he may misuse his Power; therefore the King's *Fool* shall be suffer'd to play the Madman! But upon what Footing standeth this extraordinary Claim? Why, we have a *natural Sense of the Ridiculous*; and the *Ridiculous has a natural Feeling of the Incongruous*; and then — *who can forbear laughing?* If to this, you add *Tast, Beauty, Deformity, Moral-sense, Moral-rectitude, Moral-falshood*, you have then, I think, the whole Theory of the *Ridiculous*. But I can tell him of a plain *English* Proverb worth all his Modish *Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* put together, and that is, TO BE MERRY AND WISE. Which concerns him nearer than one may think. For who would imagine, that while he was supporting Ridicule from the Charge of *Abuse*, he should be supplying his Adversary with a fresh and flagrant Exception to his own Plea? Not indeed, that the Comment disgrac'd the Text; or that there was much *Incongruity* in pleading for a Fault he had just then committed. But so it is, kind Reader, that, where he is marshalling the several Classes of Folly in human Life, he places the whole *Body of the Christian Clergy* in the First and Foremost: Amongst those, who, he tells us, *assume some desirable Quality or Possession*

Possession which evidently does not belong to them^a.

“ Others, of graver Mien, behold ; adorn’d
 “ With holy Ensigns, how *sublime* they move,
 “ And, bending oft their *sanctimonious* Eyes,
 “ Take homage of the *Simple-minded Throng*,
 “ AMBASSADORS of Heav’n.^b

And well do they deserve his *Moral-ridicule*, supposing them to be drawn *like*. For, if I understand any Thing of his Colouring, the Features are, Pride, Hypocrisy, Fraud, and Imposture. I call it an Insult on the whole Body of the Clergy, because I know of no Part of them who hold that the *Ministry* of the Gospel (or, as St. Paul calls it, of *Reconciliation*) *was given them* by the Religion of Christ, but hold likewise, with the same Apostle (who speaks of himself here as a simple Minister of the Gospel) *that they are AMBASSADORS for Christ*^c.——But let it go like what it is, a poor pitiful Joke of his Master’s^d, and spoil’d too in the telling. The *Dulness* of the *Ridicule* will sufficiently atone for the *Abuse* of it. And I may find Time to call the Great Man of *Tast* himself to account, for his so frequent and ill employed *Raillery* against RELIGION.

^a P. 49.

^b P. 96.

^c 2 Cor. v. 23.

^d Char.

Vol. II. p. 336. Third Edit.

REMARKS

On several

OCCASIONAL REFLECTIONS.

THE State of Authorship, whatever that of Nature be, is certainly a State of War: In which, especially if it be an *holy War*, every Man's hand is set, not against his Enemy, but his *Brother*. But as these furious fighting men are generally as much mistaken in the use of their Arms, as in the Objects of their Resentments, there is seldom any great Harm done. I speak for myself. I have found none. And indeed no wonder. I have been all the while very much out of the question. For my Answerers write not so properly *against* me, as *for* something they like better than me. This, for his dear *Orthodoxy*; That, for his dearer *Philosophers*; A third, for his *Lawyers*; A fourth, for his *Caballists*; A fifth, for *himself*; and a sixth for, I don't know what,

besides the pure *Love of Scribbling*^a. So that I have been now, for some time, only a silent Looker-on; to see how the Public and they would get acquainted. I have given them full Liberty to try what They can make of it, or It of them: and wish them better luck with their Readers Intellects than I have had with theirs. For, from the first to the last of them, their constant cry has been, *They do not understand me*. Now, though I can allow this to be a better Reason for their writing at me than any they have hitherto assigned; yet it would be a very bad one for my answering them; because it would keep me engaged *till they did understand me*; which I presume no gentle Reader would think a reasonable Task for one born when human Life is at the shortest. When therefore I took my last leave of the whole Tribe, in the Person of their great Exemplar and Archetype, the learned *Advocate* of Pagan Philosophy, I engaged, that if any Writers more equal to the subject should come abroad, I would return their Civility and fair Argument in such sort as that the World should see I esteemed every sincere Inquirer after Truth rather as a Friend to the Publick than an Enemy to myself. Since

^a Webster, Tillard, W* *, Bate, Morgan, Bott.

that

Occasional Reflections. 5

that time, the Misfortune I had of differing in Opinion from some Writers of great Merit and Learning has been the disagreeable Occasion of reminding me of my Promise.

S E C T. I.

See *Div. Leg.* book iv. sect. 6. *sub fin.*

OF these, the first place would be due to my very learned Friend, the Author of the elegant and useful *Letter from Rome*; who, taking entirely to himself what was meant in general of the numerous Writers on the same Subject, and the more numerous Followers of the same Hypothesis, hath done a ^b Notion of mine the Honour of his Confutation, in a *Postscript* to that *Letter*. But the same friendly Considerations, which induced him to end the *Postscript* with declaring his Unwillingness to enter further into Controversy with me, have disposed me not to enter into it at all. This, and neither any Neglect of him, nor any Force I apprehend in his Arguments, have kept me silent. In the mean time, I owe so much both to myself and the Public, as to take notice of a *Misrepresentation* of my *Argument*; and a *Change* of the *Question* in Dispute

^b *Div. Leg.* lib. iv. § 6. *sub fin.*

between

6 *Remarks on several*

between us: Without which Notice, the Controversy (as I agree to leave it in his Hands) could scarce receive an equitable Decision. The *Misrepresentation* I speak of is in these words, “ He [the Author of the D. L.] allows that “ the Writers, who have undertaken to *deduce* “ *the Rites of Popery from Paganism*, have “ *shewn an exact and surprising Likeness be-* “ *tween them in a great Variety of Instances.* “ This (says he) one would think, is allowing “ every thing that the Cause demands: It is “ every thing, I dare say, that those Writers “ desire ^c. ” That it is *every thing those Writers desire*, I can easily believe, since I see my learned Friend himself hath taken it for granted, that these two Assertions, 1. *The Religion of the present Romans derived from that of their heathen Ancestors*; and, 2. *An exact Conformity or Uniformity rather of Worship between Popery and Paganism*, are convertible Propositions. For, undertaking, as his Title Page informs us, to prove, *the Religion of the present Romans derived from that of their heathen Ancestors*; and having gone through his Arguments, he concludes them in these Words, “ But it is high time for me to conclude, being persuaded, if I do not flatter

^c Postscript, p. 228.

“ myself too much, that I have sufficiently
 “ made good WHAT I FIRST UNDERTOOK
 “ TO PROVE, an exact Conformity or Uni-
 “ formity rather of Worship between Popery
 “ and Paganism^d”. But what he *undertook*
to prove, we see, was, *The Religion of the*
present Romans derived from their heathen An-
cestors. That I have, therefore, as my learn-
 ed Friend observes, *allowed every thing those*
Writers desire, is very likely. But then, whe-
 ther I have *allowed every thing that the Cause*
d demands, is another Question. Which I think
 can never be determined in the Affirmative, till
 it be shewn that no other probable Cause can
 be assigned of this *exact Conformity between*
Papists and Pagans, but a *Borrowing or Deri-*
vation from one to the other. And I guess,
 this is not now ever likely to be done, since
 I myself have actually assigned *another*
probable Cause, namely, the *same Spirit of Su-*
perstition operating in equal Circumstances.

But this justly celebrated Writer goes on—
 “ This Question according to his [the Author
 “ of the D. L.] Notion is not to be decided
 “ by *Faëts*, but by a Principle of a different
 “ Kind, a *superior Knowledge of human Na-*
 “ *ture*.” Here I am forced to complain of

^d Letter, p. 224.

^e Postscript, p. 228.

a want of Candour, a want not natural to my learned Friend. For, whence is it, I would ask, that he collects, *that, according to my Notion, this Question is not to be decided by Facts, but a superior Knowledge of human Nature?* From any thing I have said? Or from any thing I have omitted to say? Surely, not from any thing I *have said*, (tho' he seems to insinuate so much by putting the Words, *a superior Knowledge of human Nature* in Italick Characters, as they are called) because I leave him in possession of his *Facts*, and give them all their full Validity; which he himself observes; and, from thence, as we see, endeavours to draw some Advantage to his Hypothesis: Nor from any thing I *have omitted to say*; for, in the short Paragraph where I delivered my Opinion, and, by reason of its Evidence, offered but one single Argument in its Support, that Argument arises from a supposed FACT, *viz.* that the *superstitious Customs in question were many Ages later than the Conversion of the imperial City to the Christian Faith*: Whence I concluded that the ruling Churchmen could have no Motive in borrowing from Pagan Customs, either as they were then fashionable in themselves, or respectable for the Number or Quality of their Followers. The *Supposition*
 'I could

I could easily convert into a *Proof*, were I not restrained by the Considerations before spoken of. And what makes this the more extraordinary is, that my learned Friend himself immediately afterwards quotes these words; and then tells the Reader that *the Argument consists of an HISTORICAL FACT and of a Consequence deduced from it*. It appears therefore, that, according to my Notion, the Question is to be decided by *Facts*, and not by a *superior Knowledge of human Nature*. Yet I must confess I then thought, and do so still, that a *superior Knowledge of human Nature* would do no Harm, as it might enable Men to judge better of *Facts* than we generally find them accustomed to do. But will this excuse a candid Representer for saying, that *the Question, according to my Notion, was not to be decided by Facts, but a superior Knowledge of human Nature?* However, to do my learned Friend all Justice, I must needs say, that, as if these were only Words of Course, or Words of Controversy, he goes on, thro' the Body of his *Postscript*, to invalidate my Argument from *Fact*; and we hear no more of a *superior Knowledge of human Nature* than in this Place where it was brought in to be laughed at.

As to the Argument, it must even shift for itself. It has done more Mischief already than

B

I was

I was aware of: And forced my learned Friend to extend his Charge from the *modern* to the *ancient Church of Rome*. For my Argument, from the *low Birth* of the Superstitions in Question, coming against his *Hypothesis* after he had once and again declared the Purpose of his *Letter* to be the exposing the heathenish Idolatry and Superstition of the *present Church of Rome*; he was obliged, in support of that Hypothesis, to shew that even the *early Ages* of the Church were not free from the Infection. Which hath now quite shifted the Subject with the Scene, and will make the Argument of his Piece from henceforth to run thus, *The Religion of the present Romans derived from their early Christian Ancestors; and theirs, from the neighbouring Pagans*. To speak freely, my Reasoning (which was an Argument *ad hominem*, and, as such, I thought would have been revered) reduced the learned Writer to this Dilemma; either to allow the Fact, and give up his Hypothesis; or to deny the Fact, and change his Question. And he has chosen the latter as the lesser Evil. For a simple *Question* is but like a Wife to wrangle with; and when we lose one we easily find another. But the *Hypothesis* begot upon it, is of the Nature of one's Offspring, whose Loss perhaps is irreparable. I find, however, his *Lincoln's Inn Advocate* never thought him wedded to his Question;
for

for he takes the Change of it, like the Change of a Mistress, for *Politeness*; and has accused me not only of ill breeding, but of *Contradiction*, because I would not change it too. I had *shewn*, in my *first* Volume of the *Div. Leg.* that the *ancient Christians of Greece* had borrowed *several forms of Speech* from the Pagan Mysteries: And in my *second*, I had *denied* that the *modern Christians of Rome* had borrowed *several Forms of Worship* from the Pagan Ritual. On which, our Advocate catching me at this Advantage, thus candidly expostulates with me. *Thus the SAME FACT, when it tends to prove a part of a favourite Hypothesis is in your Hands notoriously true; but it is no sooner made use of by the ingenious Author so often mentioned [Dr. M.] than it proves to be an utter Mistake*^a. And again, the *DIFFERENT OPINIONS which on different Occasions you have entertained of this Matter, may serve to teach us, &c. &c*^b. But let me assure this Writer, that when I spoke of the *Ancients* borrowing *Words* from the Pagan Mysteries, I no more meant the *Moderns* borrowing *Rites* from their *open Worship*, than, when^c I spoke of *Answerers by Profession*, meant *Lawyers by Pro-*

^a Letter from a Gentleman of Lincoln's-Inn, Page 55.

^b Page 59.

^c See Appendix to second Vol. of *Div. Leg.* p. 4.

jection; who, without flattering them, I may say, deserve as little the Character there given of the said *Answerers* as I do the Calumnies here bestowed by this *Letter Writer*.

But his Charge of *Contradiction* was excusable. The Doctor had led him up to the *primitive Church*, and there he found me; and there he supposed I had always been: And seeing me not quite conformable to the Doctor's Decisions, he would quarrel with me for a Schismatic. But I can easily overlook this, (that he took upon trust, as he did his *Greek*) for the sake of so charitable Office as the teaching me how to write; which he kindly professes to be the whole Purpose of his *Letter*.

My learned Friend will excuse my speaking thus much of a Controversy which he knows, from the Time of the first Publication of his *Postscript*, I had intended not to keep up. But thus much was necessary to state it truly, and to hold it fairly on the Foot whereon he first placed it, and I had left it. As to the Subject itself, so curious and interesting, if ever I should be disposed to treat it at large, as possibly I may, I would chuse to do it *in Thesis*, and not in prosecution of any particular Controversy.

S E C T.

S E C T. II.

See *Div. Leg.* book iv. sect. 4.

THE first Writer I am concerned with is the reverend Dr. *Richard Pococke* : Who, in his late Book of *Travels*, hath a Chapter on the ancient *Hieroglyphics of the Egyptians*, wherein, in opposition to my Account of the Nature of that Kind of Writing, he expresth himself as follows— “ If Hieroglyphical Figures stood for Words or Sounds that signified certain things, the Power of Hieroglyphics seems to be the same as of a Number of Letters composing such a Sound, that by Agreement was made to signify such a thing. For Hieroglyphics, as Words, seem to have stood for Sounds, and Sounds signify Things ; as for instance, it might have been agreed that the Figure of a Crocodile might stand for the Sound that meant what we call Malice : The children of the Priests were early taught that the Figure of a Crocodile stood for such a Sound, and, if they did not know the Meaning of the Sound, it would certainly stand with them for a Sound ; though, as the Sound,
“ it

“ it signified also a Quality or Thing ; and
“ they might afterwards be taught the Mean-
“ ing of this Sound ; as words are only Sounds,
“ which Sounds we agree shall signify such
“ and such things ; so that, to Children,
“ Words only stand for Sounds, which relate
“ to such Things as they know nothing of ;
“ and, in this Sense, we say Children learn
“ many Things like Parrots, what they do
“ not understand, and their Memories are
“ exercised only about Sounds, till they are
“ instructed in the Meaning of the Words.
“ This I thought it might be proper to ob-
“ serve, *as some say Hieroglyphics stood for*
“ *Things and not for Words*, if Sounds articu-
“ lated in a certain manner are Words. And
“ tho’ it may be said, that in this case, when
“ different Nations, of different Languages,
“ agree on common Characters, that stand for
“ certain Things they agree on, that then such
“ Figures stand for Things : This will be al-
“ lowed ; but then they stand for Sounds too,
“ that is, the Sounds in each Language that
“ signify such Things : And, as observed be-
“ fore, to Children, who know nothing of
“ the several Things they stand for ; to them
“ they are only Marks that express such and
“ such Sounds : So that these Figures stand
“ not

“ not for Things alone, but as Words, for
“ Sounds and Things^a”.

The Design of this Passage, the Reader sees, is to oppose the Principle I went upon, in explaining the Egyptian Hieroglyphics, *that they stood for Things, and not for Words*. But that is all he sees ; for the obscure Expression, arising from a Confusion of Ideas, will not suffer one to do more than guess at the Proof he aims at ; which seems to be this, — That Hieroglyphics cannot be said to stand for Things *only* ; because Things being denoted by Words or Sounds ; and Hieroglyphics exciting the Idea of Sounds (which are the Notes of Things,) as well as the Idea of the Things themselves, Hieroglyphics stand both for Sounds and Things.—This seems to be his Argument, put into intelligible Language. But, for fear of mistaking him, let us confine ourselves to his own Words.

If hieroglyphical Figures (says he) stood for Words or Sounds that signified certain Things, the Power of Hieroglyphics seems to be the same as of a Number of Letters composing such a Sound that by Agreement was made to signify such a Thing. Without doubt, if Hieroglyphics

^a Pag. 228, 229, of a Book intitled, *A Description of the East, &c.*

stood

stood for Sounds, they were of the Nature of *Words*, which stand for Sounds. But this is only an *hypothetical Proposition*: Let us see therefore how he proves it.

FOR *Hieroglyphics*, AS WORDS, *seem to have stood for Sounds, and Sounds signify Things*; as for Instance, it MIGHT have been agreed that the Figure of a Crocodile MIGHT stand for the same Sound that meant what we call *Malice*. The Propriety of the Expression is as remarkable as the Force of the Reasoning. 1. Instead of saying, *but Hieroglyphics*, he says, *for Hieroglyphics*; which not expressing an *Illation*, but implying a *Reason*, obscures the Argument he would illustrate. 2. He says, *Hieroglyphics, as Words, seem to have stood for Sounds*. Just before he said, *Hieroglyphics stood for Words OR Sounds*. Here they are AS *Words*, or, *like Words*, and *seem to stand FOR Sound*. What must we stick to? are Words Sound? or, do they *stand for Sound*? He has given us both to chuse of. But it is fit himself should chuse first: Which not having yet done, we go on, 3. Lastly, to complete all, he corroborates this *seeming Truth* by an *Instance*, in which the *Possibility* of its standing for a Sound is made a Proof of the *Likelihood* of its so doing; *It MIGHT* (says he) *have been*

been agreed that the Figure of a Crocodile MIGHT stand, &c.

But he makes amends for his former Diffidence in what follows. *The Children of the Priests were early taught that the Figure of a Crocodile stood for such a Sound, and if they did not know the meaning of the Sound it would certainly stand with them for a Sound.* This indeed is an Anecdote. But where did he learn that these Children, before they could decipher the Sounds of their own Language, were taught Hieroglyphics? 'Till now, Hieroglyphics were understood to be reserved for those instructed in their secret and mysterious Science. But let us suppose that they were taught to Children amongst their first Elements: Yet even here, as we shall see from the Nature of the Thing, they could never stand as Marks for *Words* or *Sounds*. When a Child is taught the Power of Letters, he learns that those Letters, that compose the Word, *Malice*, for instance, express the *Sound*: which, naturally arising from a Combination of the several Powers of each Letter, shews him that the Letters stand for such a Sound or Word. But when he is taught that the Figure or Picture of a *Crocodile* signifies *Malice*, he as naturally and necessarily conceives (tho' he knows not the meaning of the Word) that it stands for

C

some

some *Thing*, signified by that Word, and not for a *Sound*: because there is no natural Connexion between *Figure* and a *Sound*, as there is between *Figure* and a *Thing*. And the only Reason why the Word *Malice* intervenes, in this Connexion, is because of the Necessity of the Use of *Words* to distinguish Things, and rank them into sorts. But the veriest Child could never be so childish as to conceive that, when he was told the Figure of a Beast with four Legs and a long Tail signified *Malice*, that it signified the *Sound* of *Malice*; any more than if he were told it signified a *Crocodile*, that it signified the *Sound* of the Word *Crocodile*. The Truth is, the Ignorant often mistake Words for Things, but never, Things for Words. The former is so true that they frequently take the *name* of a Thing for its *Nature*; and rest contented in the Knowledge which that gives them. I remember a country Fellow staring at the Picture of an Elephant, a *thing* he had never seen before, asked his Friend who stood by, *What it was?* and, on his answering, that it was *the great Czar*; inquired no further, but went away well satisfied in his Acquaintance with the strange Beast. Yet I apprehend he did not understand his Informer to mean that it signified only the *Sound* of that Word. But perhaps our Au-

thor will say, the Cases are different; that the *Elephant* was a mere Picture, and the *Crocodile* a Sign or Mark. But I have proved at large that the ancient *Egyptian* Hieroglyphics were at first mere *Pictures*; and that all the Alteration they received, in becoming *Marks*, was only the having their general Use of conveying Knowledge rendered more extensive and expeditious.

To proceed; our Author considers next what he apprehends may be thought an Objection to his Opinion. *And tho' (says he) it may be said that, in this Case, where different Nations of different Languages agree on common Characters, that stand for certain Things they agree on, that then such Figures stand for Things.* To which he answers, *This will be allowed, but then they stand for Sounds too, that is, the Sounds in each Language that signify such Things.* He who can allow this, and without Injury to his Cause, need be under no Fear of ever giving his Adversary Advantages. We may expect to hear him say next, when disputing about the Colour of an Object, — *that it is Black, will be allowed; but then it is White too.* For a Mark for Things can no more be a Mark for Sounds, than *Black* can be *White*.

The Reason is the same in both ; the one Property excludes the other : Thus, if *hieroglyphic Marks* stand for *Things*, and are used as common Characters by various Nations differing in Speech and Language, they cannot stand for *Sounds* ; because these Men express the same Thing by *different* Sounds ; unless, to remove this Difficulty, he will go farther, and say, not, as he did before, that one *hieroglyphic Word* (to use his own Language) stood for *one Sound*, but, that it stands for an Hundred. Again, if *hieroglyphic Marks* stand for *Sounds*, they cannot stand for *Things* : Not for those Things which are *not* signified by such Sounds ; this himself will *allow* : Nor yet, I affirm, for those which *are* ; because it is the Sound that stands for the Thing signified by the Sound, and not the hieroglyphic Mark. But all this Mistake proceeded from another as gross, tho' less glaring, namely, *that Words stand both for Sounds and Things*, which we now come to. For he concludes thus, *So that these Figures* (viz. *Hieroglyphics*) *stand not for Things alone, but, as Words, for Sounds and Things*. An unhappy Illustration ! which has all the Defects, both in point of Sense and Expression, that a Proposition can well have.

For

For if, by *Words*, he meant *articulated Sounds*, then the Expression is Nonsense; as affirming, that Sounds stand for Sounds. And that he meant so is possible, because, in the Beginning of the Passage quoted, he uses *Words* for *articulate Sounds* — *Hieroglyphics*, says he, *stood for Words* OR *Sounds*. But if, by *Words*, he meant *Letters*, (and that he might mean so, is possible likewise, for he presently afterwards uses *Words* in that Sense too — *Hieroglyphics as Words*, says he, *seem to have stood for Sounds*) then the Proposition is only false; the plain Truth being this, *Letters stand for Sounds only*; which Sounds they *naturally* produce; as Sounds *arbitrarily* denote Things.

But to be a little more particular; as in this Distinction lies the Judgment which is to be made, if ever it be rightly made, of the Controversy between us. All this Confusion of counter-reasoning proceeds, as we observed before, *first*, from not reflecting that *Letters*, which stand for Words, and *Hieroglyphics* which stand for Things, have not an *arbitrary* but *natural* Designation. For as the *Powers* of Letters naturally produce Words or Sounds, so the *Figures* of Hieroglyphics naturally signify Things: Either more simply, when they express *Substances*; or more arti-

ficially, when they denote *Modes*; yet in neither Case arbitrarily: but by *Representation* in the first, and by *Analogy* in the last. Secondly, from his not considering, that as we cannot think nor converse about Things either accurately or intelligibly without *Words*, so their Intervention becomes necessary in explaining the *Marks of Things*. But therefore, to make *Hieroglyphics the Marks of Sounds*, because Sounds accompany *Things*, would be as absurd as to make *Letters the Marks of Things*, because Things accompany *Sounds*. And, whoever (besides our Author) said that *Letters signified Things as well as Sounds*? unless he had a Mind to confound all human Meaning. If he chose to instruct, or even to be understood, he would say, that Letters *naturally* produced Sounds or Words; and that Words *arbitrarily* denoted Things: And had our Author spoken the same intelligible Language, and told us that Hieroglyphics *naturally* expressed Things, and that Things were *arbitrarily* denoted by Words, he would indeed have spared both of us the present Trouble, but then he had said nothing new. But it is possible he might be led into his Conclusion by mistaking, for *Egyptian*, a ridiculous Kind of *rebus-writing* more ridiculously called Hieroglyphics, the senseless Amusements

usement of our idle People, in which, indeed, the Figures stand, only for Sounds. As for those significative Figures properly called Hieroglyphics, they never denoted other than *Things*. If there ever were an Exception, it was in a late Traveller; whose significative Egyptian *Figures*, I am told, are not so properly the Representatives of the *Things* themselves, as of the Writer's *Words*, or his verbal Descriptions to the Ingraver. — But there is no End of correcting the Extravagancies of a perverse Imagination. Here we have one, who is for making the Egyptian *Hieroglyphics* a Kind of Letters: We have lately heard of another, still more at Defiance with common Sense, who is for making the *Hebrew* Letters a Kind of *Hieroglyphic* Characters^a. And this without ever having travelled for it.

^a See *Proposals for printing by Subscription the Book of Job in the Hebrew Character, and now first Decyphered into English, dated July 1, 1743*. From which, I shall beg Leave to borrow a Specimen of the Undertaker's Reasoning and Eloquence. To obviate (says he) any Scruples of Alarm which the Appearance of Novelty and Paradox might occasion, it may be proper to acquaint the Reader—What?—that the new Version of Job, now offered to the Public, was made independently of any Translation, Commentator, or Critic, &c. Without doubt it was a ready way to quiet all Alarms, arising from the Appearance of Novelty, to tell his Readers, the Appearance was real. But perhaps
But

But our Author seems to have been misled by a wrong Imagination ; that the Public would expect it of a *Traveller* to be intimately conversant in all the old Learning and Religion of the Places he had visited : As if these were to

by—*obviating any Scruples of Alarm*, this great Linguist might mean, what the Words naturally imply, the freeing his Reader from any *Scruples* about the Uncharitableness of being *alarmed* to one's Neighbours Discredit without very apparent Cause. And if this were his Meaning, he has certainly set his Reader's Conscience at Ease. But with Regard to the *Alarm* itself, I know but one way of stilling *that* ; which is, the reasonable Prospect his Reader has that this, which is now a *Novelty* and *Paradox*, is likely to continue so.

He goes on — *In the mean time, if the sagacious Reader is prompted to search after Truth, too long concealed in her mysterious Recesses—let him guard against all Systematical Notions, and assume no other Hypothesis but this, that the best Sense which can be affixed to the Hebrew Letters, consistently with the Context, and with the Laws of the Character, is the genuine Sense of the Writer.* The *Context*, does he say ? Why, the *Context* is yet to make ; as well as the *Sense that is to be affixed to the Hebrew Letters*. And if, when he has them both in his Hands, he can't make them agree, he must be the very dullest of all his bungling Tribe. The Man had heard, somewhere or other, of that trite critical Canon, *of interpreting agreeably to the Context*, which means only that the Parts should conform to the whole, and to one another ; and the more obscure be explained by the more intelligible : And this, he has innocently applied to *Parts* and a *Whole* that are to be all of his own making ; which he may make as obscure at least, if not as intelligible as he pleases.

be

be picked out of the Rubbish of the dead Walls in which they were once contained, rather than from the living Monuments of their contemporary Inhabitants. But sure the learned World is less unreasonable ; this would exceed even

Having thus strongly *plumed* himself with his Grey-Goose Quill, he at length takes his Flight. — *Thus prepared* (he says) *he will defy Difficulty and scorn Assistance ; esteeming an officious Hint an Affront to his Genius, or suspecting he was envied the Pleasure of investigating the Theorem. Fantastic Glory ! short-lived Pleasure ! that must vanish into Indignation, for not having sooner perceived so transparent an Artifice.* But here we leave him. He now soars out of Sight, and becomes inscrutable to mortal Eyes.

Indeed, he might have passed without any Notice at all, had he not betrayed his *Kind* when he attempted to *rear*. For, though it be his Business to possess the Public with an high Idea of the Knowledge he is about to open to them from the Discovery of a *new real CYPHER*, yet he can't, for his Life, (even in this very *Specimen*) forbear to call it a SACERDOTAL *Jargon* — a *Gibberish of their own*. Let the *Priests* then look to themselves. Here is a *new Church-Decipherer*, who has not only discovered they are accustomed to write in *Jargon*, but has also found the *Key*. We know them to be always plotting against the *Government of Nature* : The Public therefore can't but be as impatient for their Conviction, as this *Decipherer* is for the filling his *Subscription* : Which, as it will be the Means of satisfying both, I would beg Leave to recommend to their Consideration. *Subscriptions are taken in by J. Nourse at the Lamb without Temple-Bar.*

the

26 *Remarks on several*

the old *Egyptian* Exaction, and be requiring *Brick*, not indeed without *Straw*, for enough of that, we see, is to be *gathered* in rambling *through the Land*; but, what is worse, without *Materials*. However, to this Imagination it appears we owe his Account of the *Hieroglyphics* in the *present*, and of the *Mythology of the antient Egyptians*, in the preceding Chapter; which he introduces in this extraordinary Manner: “ As the Mythology, “ or fabulous Religion of the ancient *Egyptians*, may be looked on, in a great Measure, “ as the Foundation of the Heathen Religion, “ in most other Parts; so it may not be improper to give some Account of the Origin “ of it, as it is delivered by the most ancient Authors, which may give some Light “ both to the Description of *Egypt*, and also to “ the History of that Country. We may suppose, that the Ancients were the best Judges “ of the Nature of their Religion; and “ consequently, that all Interpretations of their “ Mythology, by Men of fruitful Inventions, “ that have no sort of Foundation in their “ Writings, are forced, and such as might “ never be intended by them. On the contrary

“ trary it is necessary to retrench several things
“ the Ancients themselves seem to have in-
“ vented, and grafted on true History; and,
“ in order to account for many Things, the
“ Genealogies and Alliances they mention,
“ must in several Respects be false or errone-
“ ous, and seem to have been invented to ac-
“ commodate the Honours of the same Deities
“ to different Persons, they were obliged to
“ deify, who lived at different Times; and
“ so they were obliged to give them new
“ Names, invent Genealogies, and some dif-
“ ferent Attributes ^a.”

He says, *We may suppose that the Ancients were the best Judges of the Nature of their Religion.* But the *Ancients*, here spoken of, were not *Egyptians*, but *Greeks*; and the *Mythology* here spoken of, was not *Greek*, but *Egyptian*: Therefore these *Ancients* might well be mistaken about the Nature of a Religion which they borrowed from Strangers; the Principles of which they themselves tell us, were always kept secreted from them. But this is not all, they in fact were mistaken; and by no means *good Judges of the Nature of their Religion*, if we may believe one of the most authentic of these Ancients, HE-

^a P. 221, 222.

24 *Remarks on several*

RODOTUS himself, where discoursing of the Greeks he expressly says,— “ But the Origin of
“ each God, and whether they are all from
“ Eternity, and what is their several Kinds or
“ Natures, to speak the Truth, they neither
“ knew at that time nor since ^b.”

He goes on—and CONSEQUENTLY *that all Interpretations of their Mythology by Men of fruitful Inventions, that have no sort of Foundation in their Writings, are forced, and such as might never be intended by them.* This is indeed a Truth, but it is NO CONSEQUENCE, therefore impertinent. For, whether the *Ancients* were, or were not, *the best Judges*; whether the *Moderns* have, or have not, *fruitful Inventions*, yet if their *Interpretations* have no sort of *Foundation in ancient Writings*, it is certain they are forced, and such as might never be intended by them. But what does he get by this hypothetical Proposition more than the Discredit of begging his Question?

But the most extraordinary, is his making it an additional Reason for leaving the *Moderns*, and sticking to the *Ancients*, that *the Ancients themselves seem to have invented and grafted on true History*; and, in order (he says) to ac-

^b Ἐνθεν δὲ ἐγένετο ἕκαστος τῶν Θεῶν, εἴτε δ' αὖτ' ἦσαν πάντες, ὁμοῖοί τε τινὲς τὰ εἶδεα, ἢ καὶ ἡπιστάτο μέχρι ἢ πρὶν τε καὶ ὕστερ, ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ. Lib. ii. cap. 53.

count for many Things, the Genealogies and Alliances they mention, must in several respects be false or erroneous, and seem to have been invented, etc. Now, if the Ancients were thus mistaken, the Moderns sure might be excused in endeavouring to set them right: Therefore to a plain Reasoner, this would seem to shew the use of their Interpretations. But this Use is better understood from our Author's own Example; who, in the Chapter we are upon has attempted to give us some Knowledge of Antiquity without them.

And here we find, the ancient Account, to which he so closely adheres, is not only fabulous, by his own Confession; but contradictory, by his own Representation; a confused Collection of Errors and Absurdities; the very Condition of Antiquity which forced the Moderns to have Recourse to Interpretations; and occasioned that Variety whereon our Author grounds his Charge against them. A Charge however in which his Ancients themselves will be involved; for they likewise had their Interpretations; and were, if their Variety would give it them, at least, as fruitful in their Inventions. How differing for instance, were they in Opinion concerning the Origin of ANIMAL WORSHIP^a? Was

^a See Div. Leg. vol. ii. p. 166. & seq.

our Author ignorant that so extraordinary a Superstition wanted Explanation? By no means. Yet for fear of incurring the Censure of a *fruitful Invention*, he, instead of taking the true Solution of a *Modern Critic*; or even any rational Interpretation ^b of the *ancient Mythologist*, whom yet he professes to follow, contents himself with that wretched Fable of *Typhon's* dividing the Body of *Osiris* into twenty six Parts, and distributing them to his Accomplices: Which, being afterwards found by *Isis*, and delivered by her to distinct Bodies of Priests to be buried with great Secrecy, she enjoined them to pay divine Honours to him, and to consecrate some particular Animal to his Memory. *From this*

^b This, at least, the learned Author of the late *Defence of the prime Ministry of Joseph* has thought it but decent to do, p. 522. whom I just mention here because he does not so properly come within the Purpose of this Pamphlet. For as, in several Parts of his *Defence*, he consents to me without Acknowledgment; so, in others, he differs from me without Contradiction. I have another Reason not to examine the Grounds of his Difference, and that is because, I apprehend he may, on second Thoughts, retract his Opinion on every of those Points, as he seems already to have done in one or two. Thus for instance, speaking p. 522. of the *Origin of Brute-worship*, in Egypt, he says, *But there is another Reason [of Brute-worship] assigned by Lucian, that to me is the most probable of all. He tells us that the Egyptians found out how to measure the Motions of the heavenly Bodies, and how to compute Years and Months and Seasons. They divided that Part of the Heavens and the fixed Stars stationed in it, through which the moveable Stars and Planets pass, into twelve Parts, and represented each Part by some proper different Animal of their own.*

Account (says our Author very gravely) we may see the Reason why so many sacred Animals were worshipped in Egypt^a. Again, the Greek Account, in *Diodorus*, of *Osiris's Expedition*, has been shewn to be a Heap of im-

And from hence arose many Sorts of sacred Rites in Egypt, &c. Yet at p. 458. he assigns a very different Original. *I think there is little doubt but that the monstrous Figures of the Egyptian Gods, and great Part of their stupid Idolatry and Beast-worship took its Rise from these hieroglyphic Characters.* —

So again, p. 472. speaking of the Origin of Idolatry, he makes the first Species of it to be HERO-WORSHIP. *And I think* (says he) *that the Account given of them [the Sons of the Elohim in the antediluvian World] by the Historian, that they were the mighty Men of old, Men of the Name, as the Hebrew expresses it, famous and remarkable from ancient Ages, points them out as the most ancient, Gods and Heroes; a Supposition that we shall see presently confirmed by the Testimony of profane History.* Yet at p. 515. he makes the Beginnings of Idolatry to be the Worship of the HEAVENLY BODIES. *These several Accounts put together clearly shew us the Rise and Progress of Superstition and false Worship in the World. It began, as it was natural to imagine it should, in the Adoration of the heavenly Luminaries, the Sun, Moon and Stars, who were supposed to preside over the Day and Night, and the various Seasons of the Year, and to whom the earliest Nations were taught to ascribe the Origin and Dissolution of all Things. Next after these the Earth, and the several Elements of which the World was supposed to consist, had imaginary Deity ascribed to them, and came in for their Share of Adoration. And as the Glory of the celestial Bodies, and the constant Benefit Men received by their Light, Warmth, and continual Influences on the Earth, first impressed Men with Wonder, drew them into Adoration, excited their Gratitude, and created in them an Imagination of their being Gods; they were AFTERWARDS led into an high Veneration for their Princes whom they admired for their Power, Prudence, Strength, and Knowledge; considering them as their Benefactors who first taught them the Use of such Things as greatly tended to the Preservation, Security, good Order and Conveniences of Life.*

^a P. 226

possible Absurdities; yet our Author believes it all; and would have believed as much more rather than have run into the Rashness of any *modern Invention*. — But this Matter comes under our next *Section*; where we have to do with a very different Sort of Writer; whose Regard, however, for Antiquity in *that* point is, we conceive, as much too small as this Author's is too great.

S E C T. III.

See *Div. Leg.* Book iv. sect. 5.

WHEN I entered on a Confutation of Sr. Isaac Newton's *Egyptian Chronology*, I was willing, for the greater Satisfaction of the Reader, to set his Arguments for the *Identity of Osiris and Sesostris*, on which that Chronology was founded, in the strongest and clearest Light. On this account I took them as I found them collected, ranged in Order, and set together in one View, with the greatest Advantage of Representation, by the very worthy and learned *Master of the Charter-house*, in a professed Apology for that excellent Author. But this Liberty the learned Writer hath been pleased to animadvert upon in the late *Latin Edition** of the Tracts to

* *De veris annis D. N. Jesu Christi natali & emortuali Dissertationes duæ Chronologicae.*

which

which that Apology was prefixed——“ We
 “ are not (says he ^b) ignorant of what has
 “ lately happened, that the Author of *the*
 “ *Divine Legation* supposing it, some how
 “ or other, to concern *Moses's* divine Mis-
 “ sion to prove that *Osiris* was not the
 “ same with *Sesostris*, hath turned all that
 “ is here said into Ridicule, by a Compa-
 “ rison made between the fabulous *Arthur*
 “ and *William* the *Norman*; who, he
 “ says, may be made one by as good Reasons
 “ (tho' they have scarce any thing alike or in
 “ common with one another) as those which

^b “ Non nescimus nuperrime accidisse, ut Vir ingenio &
 “ eruditione præstans *, quum ratus sit ad Divinam Legatio-
 “ nem Mosis demonstrandum aliquo modo pertinere, ut pro-
 “ betur Osiris non esse idem cum Sesostri, omnia huc allata in
 “ lusum jocumque verterit, instituta comparatione Arthuri
 “ illius fabulosi cum Wilhelmo Normanno, quos æquè bonis
 “ rationibus in unum hominem conflari posse ait (quamvis
 “ nihil fere habeant inter se commune aut simile) ac nos Ofi-
 “ rin cum Sesostri confundimus. Et de hac re disputationem
 “ in 70 paginas & ultra producit. In qua tamen hæc nostra
 “ de Sesostri neque negat neque refellit, sed irridet. Alia
 “ vero quædam Newtoni dicta de fero inventis ab aliquo rege
 “ artibus, armis, instrumentis oppugnat, et ea quidem parte
 “ causæ vincit. Nam ut ista longe ante Sesostris ætatem apud
 “ Ægyptios reperta sint, Scriptura sacra jubet credere; ab
 “ ullo unquam regum inventa esse haud ita certum. Sed ea
 “ prius non attigimus, ut quæ nihil ad propositum nostrum
 “ attinent, neque nunc nos movent, ut pedem retrahamus ab
 “ ista Cl. Newtoni conclusione Sefacum, Sesostrim, Osirin &
 “ Bacchum fuisse. Lite jam contestata judicent eruditi.” *In*
Dedic. p. xii. xiii.

* D. Warburton Div. Legat. Mosis Demonstr. &c. Tom. ii.

“ we

“ we have brought to confound *Osiris* with
 “ *Sesostris* : And on this Point he draws out
 “ a Disputation thro’ seventy Pages and up-
 “ wards ; wherein, notwithstanding, he nei-
 “ ther denies nor confutes, but only laughs at
 “ what we have here said of *Sesostris*. It is true
 “ indeed that some other of *Newton*’s Assertions
 “ he does oppose, as those concerning the late
 “ Invention of Arts, Arms, and Instruments
 “ by some certain King ; and in this Part of
 “ the Argument he has the better. For that
 “ these Things were found out by the *Egyp-*
 “ *tians* long before the Age of *Sesostris* holy
 “ Scripture commands us to believe : But
 “ whether found out by any of their Kings is
 “ not so certain. However, these were Mat-
 “ ters we never touched upon, as relating no-
 “ thing to our Purpose ; nor do they yet in-
 “ duce us to recede from that Conclusion of
 “ the famous *Newton*, That *Sesac* was *Seso-*
 “ *stris*, *Osiris*, and *Bacchus*. But the Cause
 “ being now brought before the Public let
 “ the Learned determine of it.” Thus far
 this candid and ingenuous Writer.

He says, *the Author of the Divine Legation*
supposes that it some how or other concerns Moses’s
divine Mission to prove Osiris not the same with
Sesostris ; which seems to imply that this
learned Person doth not see how it concerns it.

And

And yet afterwards he owns, *that Scripture* (meaning the Writings of Moses) *will not allow us to believe, with Sir Isaac, that the Invention of Arts, Arms, and Instruments was so late as the Time of Sesostris.* Now it follows, as I have shewn, by certain Consequence, that, if *Osiris* and *Sesostris* were one and the same, then the Invention of Arts was as late as the Time of *Sesostris*. But this contradicting *Scripture*, or the Writings of *Moses*, as the learned Writer himself confesseth, the Reader sees *how it concerns Moses's Mission to prove Osiris not the same with Sesostris.*

The learned Writer, speaking of the Comparison I had made between *Arthur* and *William the Norman*, says, *they have scarce any thing alike or in common with one another.* I had brought together *thirteen* Circumstances (the very number the learned Writer thinks sufficient to establish the Identity of *Osiris* and *Sesostris*) in which they perfectly agreed. I am persuaded he does not suspect me of falsifying their History. He must mean therefore that *thirteen* in my Comparison, is *scarce any thing*, which, in his, is *every thing*.

He goes on,—in a *Disputation of seventy Pages and upwards the Author of the Divine Legation neither denies nor confutes, but only laughs at what we have said of Sesostris.*

What

What is it the learned Writer *hath* said of *Sesostris*? Is it not this? That between his History and that of *Osiris* there are many Strokes of Resemblance: From whence he infers (with Sir *Isaac*) that these two Heroes were one and the same. Now if he means I have not *denied* nor *confuted* this *Resemblance*, he says true. I had no such Design. It is too well marked by Antiquity to be denied. Neither, let me add, did I *laugh* at it. What I *laughed* at (if my bringing a similar case is to be called by that Word) was his *Inference* from this *Resemblance*, that therefore *Osiris* and *Sesostris* were one and the same. But then too I did more than *laugh*: I both *denied* and *confuted* it. First I *denied* it, by shewing that this *Resemblance* might really be tho' *Osiris* and *Sesostris* were two different Men, as appeared by an equal Resemblance in the actions of two different Men, *Arthur* and *William the Norman*. But as the general History of ancient *Egypt* would not suffer us to believe all that the *Greek* Writers have said of this *Resemblance*, I then explained the Causes that occasioned their mistaken Accounts of the two persons, from whence so perfect a Resemblance arose. Secondly, I *confuted* it, by shewing from the concurrent Testimony of Antiquity, and from several internal Arguments deducible from that Testimony,

Testimony, that *Osiris and Sesostris* were in fact two different Persons, living in two very distant Ages.

The learned Writer proceeds,—*It is true indeed that some other of Newton's Assertions he does oppose, as those concerning the late Invention of Arts, Arms, and Instruments, and in this Part of the Argument he gets the better.* But if I have the better here, it is past Dispute I overthrow the whole Hypothesis of the *Identity of Osiris and Sesostris*. For, as to that *Resemblance*, which Antiquity hath given them, *that*, considered singly, when the pretended *late Invention* of Arts hath been proved a Mistake, will indeed deserve *only to be laughed at*. But were it, as Sir *Isaac Newton* endeavoured to prove, that the Invention of Arts was no earlier than the Time of *Sesostris* or *Sesac*, there is then indeed an end of the *ancient Osiris* of *Egypt*; and *He* so much boasted of by that People can be no other than the *Sesostris* of this Author. For the very Foundation of the Existence of the *ancient Osiris* was his civilizing *Egypt*, and teaching them the Arts of Life: But if this were done by *Sesostris*, or in his Reign, then is *He* the true *Osiris* of *Egypt*. As on the contrary, were the *Invention of Arts* as early as Scripture History represents it, then is *Egypt* to be believed,

E

when

when she tells us that *Osiris*, their Inventor of Arts, was many Ages earlier than *Sesoftris* their Conqueror: And consequently all Sir *Isaac Newton's Identity* separates and falls to pieces. In a word, take it which way you will, if *Osiris* were the same as *Sesoftris*, then must the Invention of Arts (for all Antiquity have concurred in giving that Invention to *Osiris*) be as late as the Age of *Sesoftris*, the *Sesac* of *Newton*: But this, Scripture History will not suffer us to believe. If, on the other hand, *Osiris* and *Sesoftris* were not the same, then was the Invention of Arts (and for the same Reason) much earlier than the Age of *Sesoftris*; as indeed all Mankind thought before Sir *Isaac*. These were the Considerations which induced that great Man, who so well understood the Nature and Force of Evidence, to employ his whole Sagacity of Criticism in proving the Invention of Arts to be about the Age of his *Sesoftris* or *Sesac*. And is it possible he should have a Follower who cannot see that he hath done this? or the *Necessity* he had of doing it? It will be said, perhaps, "that Sir *Isaac* has, indeed, argued much for " the low Invention of Arts: but hath neither inforced it under the Name of an Argument, nor stated it in the Form here represented." The Objection would ill become

come a Follower of the great *Newton*, who should know that his Master's Method, as well in these his *critical* as in his *physical* Inquiries, was to form the principal Members of his Demonstration with an unornamented Brevity, and leave the Supplial of the small connecting Parts to his Reader's Capacity. Besides, in so obvious, so capital, so necessary an Argument for this *Identity*, it had been a ridiculous Distrust of common Sense, after he had spent so much Pains in endeavouring to prove the *low Invention of Arts*, to have ended his Reasoning in this formal Manner: "And
" now, Reader, take Notice that this is a con-
" clusive Argument for the *Identity* of *Osiris*
" and *Sesostris*." Lastly, let me observe, that this very Reason which induced Sir *Isaac* to be so large in the *Establishment* of his Point, the *low Invention of Arts*, induced me to be as large in the *Subversion* of it. And now some reasonable Account, I hope, is given of the seventy long Pages.

What follows is still more extraordinary —
However these were Matters (says the learned Writer, speaking of the Invention of Arts) *we never touched upon as relating nothing to our Purpose*. Here I cannot but lament the learned Writer's ill Fortune. There was but one single Point, in the Book he would defend,

which is essentially to his Purpose, and *that*, he hath given up as *nothing to his Purpose*; And more unlucky still, on a Review of the Argument, hath treated it as an Error in his Author who took so much Pains about it, but yet as an Error that does not at all affect the Question. For,

He concludes thus — *nor do they yet induce me to recede from that Conclusion of the famous Newton, that Sefac was Sefostris, Osiris, and Bacchus.* — *Sefac*, as I said before, I have no Concern with. And as to *Bacchus*, it is agreed to be only a different Name for *Osiris*. The thing I undertook to prove was that *Osiris* and *Sefostris* were not one and the same Person: But, in doing this, I did not mean to say that *Osiris* was not one of the Names of *Sefostris*. This is a very different Proposition: and the rather to be taken notice of, because I suspect a Quibble in the Words of the learned Writer which would confound the *Difference*. Nor is this Suspicion unreasonable. For I have met with some who have even ventured to say that Sir *Isaac* meant no more than that *Sefostris* was AN *Osiris*. But if he meant no more, I would allow him to mean any thing, and never to have his Meaning disputed. I, for my part, and so I suppose the rest of the World, understood him to mean, “ That the
“ old

“ old *Osiris*, famous amongst the *Egyptians*
 “ for Legislation and the Invention of the Arts
 “ of Life, was the very same Man with *Se-*
 “ *sostris*, who, those *Egyptians* say, was a
 “ different Man, of a later Age, and famous
 “ for the Conquest of the habitable World.”
 This was the Proposition I undertook to con-
 fute. Wherein I endeavoured to shew, “ that
 “ there was a *real Osiris*, such as the *Egyp-*
 “ *tians* represented him, much *earlier* than
 “ their *Sesostris*.” And now (to use this
 Writer’s Words) *the Cause being brought before*
the Public, let the Learned determine of it. As
 to the other Point, that *Sesostris* went by the
 Name of the earlier Hero, this I not only al-
 low, but contend for, as it opens to us one of
 the principal Grounds of that Confusion in
 their Stories which hath produced a Similitude
 of Actions whereon Sir *Izaak Newton* layeth
 the Foundation of their IDENTITY.

S E C T. IV.

See *Div. Leg.* Vol. ii. Book vi. sect. 2.

TH E reverend and learned Dr. *Richard*
Gray having lately epitomized the Com-
 mentary of one *Albert Schultens* on the Book
 of *Job*, hath thought fit, in the *Preface* to his
 Abstract, to criticise my Dissertation on the
 same

same Book in the following manner. — “ Nor
 “ should we omit, in the fourth place, the
 “ Opinion of our Countryman, Mr. *Warbur-*
 “ *ton*, who, with great Sharpness of Wit and
 “ many Arguments sufficiently specious, en-
 “ deavours to prove that the whole Book of
 “ *Job* is dramatical and allegorical, yet found-
 “ ed in true History, and written by *Esdra* in
 “ Solace of the *Jews*, now returned from *Ba-*
 “ *bylon* into their own Country, and about to
 “ experience, contrary to their Expectations,
 “ an ordinary and unequal Providence. Now
 “ in a matter very uncertain, and which hi-
 “ therto hath been made more uncertain by
 “ the different Opinions of learned Men, hard-
 “ ly any Hypothesis perhaps can be thought
 “ of which will satisfy in all its Parts. * ”
 Then having told us what *Spanheim* said, and
 what his Author *Schultens* says, which are no-
 thing to the matter in hand, he goes on thus :

*—Non autem prætermittenda est, quarto, sententia doctissimi viri Warburtoni nostri, qui magno ingenii acumine, multisque argumentis, satis quidem speciosis, probare nititur, Totum librum esse opus dramaticum & allegoricum, veræ tamen historię superstructum, ab *Esdra* conscriptum, in solatium Judæorum, qui e Babylone in suam patriam reversi, providentiam ordinariam & inæqualem, contra atque expectabant, jam erant experturi. In re admodum sane incerta, & quæ eruditorum hominum dissensione incertior adhuc reddita est, vix ulla forsan hypothesis excogitari possit, quæ ex omni parte satisfaciat. — Ut ad eorum itaque sententiam accedo, qui librum Jobi omnium sacrorum codicum antiquissimum esse putant; ita a Moyse qui-

“ There-

“ Therefore as I am of their Opinion who
 “ think the Book of *Job* the oldest in the
 “ Canon, so I am fully persuaded that it was
 “ written by *Moses* himself, who took it from
 “ authentic Records, and put it into the Dress
 “ of Poetry. — And, on this our Opinion,

dem ex authenticis monumentis desumptum, poeticeque ornatum fuisse, nullus dubito. — Atque ex nostra hac opinione ratio satis idonea reddi potest omnium eorum textuum, siqui sint, in quibus sive ad legem, sive ad historiam Judaicam ante scriptum librum, allusum est, non minus acsi ab Esdra eum scriptum fuisse concedatur, de quo viro diversa sentiunt eruditi. Quod vero ad eos locos, quos ad sequiorum temporum historias referre putat vir doctissimus, nempe ad Hezekiæ ægritudinem & convalescentiam, cap. xxxiii. 25. & exercitus Assyrii interuersionem, cap. xxxiv. 20. ita eos intelligi ut nihil necesse est, ita commodius aliter accipi posse, ex notis, ad quas lectorem remitto, satis apparebit. Porro, opus esse dramaticum, seu potius veram historiam forma dramatica, habituque poetico exornatam, semper existimavi; at vero subesse quoque allegoriam, persuaderi nequeo, siquidem non scriptoris tantum ætas, sed & libri scopus, quantum ego quidem video, ei sententiæ adversatur. Nam quod dicit vir clariss. id præcipue in hoc libro disceptari, nempe an bonis semper bona, malisque mala, an utrisque utraque promiscue obtingant; hanc autem quæstionem (a nobis quidem alienam, minusque ideo perpensam) nusquam alibi gentium præterquam in Judæa, nec apud ipsos Judæos alio quovis tempore, quam quod assignat, moveri potuisse, id omne ex veritate suæ hypotheseos pendet, et mea quidem sententia, longe aliter se habet. Nempe id unum voluisse mihi videtur facer scriptor, ut piis omnibus, utcunque afflictis, humilitatis & patientiæ perpetuum extaret documentum ex contemplatione gemina, hinc infinitæ Dei perfectionis, sapientiæ ac potentiæ; illinc humanæ, quæ in sanctissimis quoque viris inest, corruptionis, imbecillitatis, & ignorantiae. Quamvis enim in sermonibus, qui in eo habentur, de religione, de virtute, de providentia, Deique in mundo gubernando sapientia, justitia, sanctitate, de uno rerum omnium principio, aliisque gravissimis

“ a good

“ a good Account may be given of all those
 “ Texts, if any such there be, wherein Allu-
 “ sion is made to the Jewish Law or History
 “ before the Book was written, no less than
 “ if we should allow it to have been written
 “ by *Esdra*s, of whom the Learned think

veritatibus dissertetur, hunc tamen quem dixi unicum esse libri scopum, tam ex initio & fine, quam ex universa ejus œconomia cuivis opinor manifestum erit. Ea enim, ut rem omnem summam complectar, Jobum exhibet, primo quidem querentem, expositulantem, effrœni luctui indulgentem; mox (quum, ut sacri dramatis natura postulabat, amicorum contradicitione finistrisque suspicionibus magis magisque irritatus & laceffitus esset) imprudentius Deum provocantem, atque in justitia sua gloriantem; ad debitam tandem summisionem suique cognitionem revocatum, tum demum, nec antea, integritatis suæ tam præmium, quam testimonium a Deo reportantem. Ex his, inquam, apparet, non primario agi in hoc libro de providentia, five æquali, five inæquali, sed de personali Jobi integritate. Hanc enim (quod omnino observandum est) in dubium vocaverant amici, non ideo tantum quod afflictus esset, sed quod afflictus impatientius se gereret, Deique justitiæ obmurmuraret: & qui strenuus videlicet aliorum hortator fuerat ad fortitudinem & constantiam, quum ipse tentaretur, victus labasceret. Quum accesserat sanctissimi viri malis hæc gravissima omnium tentatio, ut tanquam improbus & hypocrita ab amicis damnaretur, & quod unicum ei supererat, conscientiæ suæ testimonio ac solatio, quantum ipsi potuerunt, privandus foret, quid misero faciendum erat? Amicos perfidiæ & crudelitatis arguit: Deum integritatis suæ testem vindicemque appellat: quum autem nec Deus interveniret, ad innocentiam ejus vindicandam, nec remitterent quicquam amici de acerbis suis censuris, injustisque criminationibus, ad supremum illud judicium provocat in quo redemptorem sibi affuturum, Deumque a suis partibus staturum, summa cum fiducia se novisse affirmat. Jam vero si cardo controversiæ fuisset, utrum, salva Dei justitia, sancti in hac vita adfligi possent, hæc ipsa declaratio litem finire debuerat. Sin autem de personali Jobi innocentia disceptetur, nil mirum quod veterem canere cantilenam, Jobumque ut fecerant, condemnare pergerent focii, quum Dei solius erat, qui corda ho-

“ differently. And as to those Places which,
 “ in the Opinion of the Author of the *D. L.*
 “ refer to Histories of later Times, such as
 “ the Sickness and Recovery of *Hezekiah*,
 “ cap. xxxiii. 25. and the Destruction of the
 “ *Assyrian Army*, cap. xxxiv. 20. it will
 “ sufficiently appear, by the Notes, to which
 “ I refer the Reader, that there is no need to
 “ understand them in this Sense, and that
 “ they are more commodiously understood
 “ otherwise. Further, that the Work is
 “ dramatical, or to speak more properly, a
 “ true History in the Form of a Drama, and
 “ adorned with a poetic Dress, was always my
 “ Opinion : But that any Allegory lies under
 “ it I can by no means persuade myself to be-
 “ lieve ; because not only the Age of the
 “ Writer, but the very Scope of the Book (as
 “ far as I can see) leads us to conclude other-

minum explorat, pro certo scire, an jure merito sibi Jobus hoc
 solamen attribueret, an falsam sibi fiduciam vanus arrogaret.
 Hac igitur difficultate sublata, nempe cur non statim obmutue-
 runt amici, quum de futuro judicio tam solenniter magnificeque
 dixisset Jobus, nil obstat quo minus celebrem illum contextum
 cap. xix. non de temporali in integrum restitutione, sed de re-
 surrectione ad vitam æternam, intelligere possis. Quod si ar-
 gumentis a commentatore nostro allatis, ea quoque adjeceris
 quæ vir omni laude major, jam episcopus Sarisburiensis, in dis-
 sertatione sua, *De sententia veterum de circumstantiis & conse-*
quentiis lapsus humani pulcherrime contexuit, nil ultra, credo,
 desiderari, vel ad libri antiquitatem, vel ad vexatissimi hujus
 loci sensum, confirmandum. *Præf. p. x—xv.*

“ wise. For as to what this Writer says, that
“ the main Question handled in the Book of *Job*
“ is whether Good happens to the Good, and
“ Evil to evil Men, or whether both happen
“ not promiscuously to both : and that this
“ Question (a very foreign one to us, and
“ therefore the less attended to) could never
“ be the Subject of Disputation any where
“ but in the Land of *Judæa*, nor there neither
“ at any other time than that which he assigns : All this, I say, depends on the
“ Truth of his Hypothesis ; and is, in my
“ Opinion, far otherwise. For the sole
“ Purpose of the sacred Writer seems to me
“ to be this, to compose a Work that should
“ remain a perpetual Document of Humility
“ and Patience to all good Men in Affliction,
“ from this two-fold Consideration, as on
“ the one hand, of the infinite Perfection,
“ Power, and Wisdom of God ; so on the
“ other of human Corruption, Imbecillity,
“ and Ignorance, discoverable even in the best
“ of Men. For altho’ in the Speeches that
“ occur there be much Talk of Religion,
“ Virtue, and Providence ; of God’s Wisdom,
“ Justice, and Holiness in the Government of
“ the World ; of one Principle of all things,
“ and other most important Truths ; yet that
“ this, which I have assigned, is the only
“ Scope

“ Scope of the Book, will appear manifest to
“ every one as well from the beginning and
“ the end, as from the Oeconomy of the
“ whole. For to say all in a word, it first
“ presents *Job* complaining, expostulating,
“ and indulging himself in an ungovernable
“ Grief, but soon after (when, as the Nature
“ of the sacred Drama required, by the Con-
“ tradiction of his Friends and their sinister
“ Suspicions he became more and more teized
“ and irritated) rashly challenging God, and
“ glorying in his own Integrity; yet at length
“ brought back to a due Submission and
“ Knowledge of himself; and then, at last,
“ and not before, receiving from God both
“ the Reward and Testimony of his Upright-
“ ness. From all this, I say, it appears that
“ the personal Integrity of *Job*, and not the
“ Question concerning an equal or unequal
“ Providence, is the principal Subject of the
“ Book. For *that* it was, (and there our
“ Attention should be fixed) which his Friends
“ doubted of; not so much on account of his
“ Affliction, as for the not bearing his Afflic-
“ tion with Patience, but complaining of the
“ Justice of God. And that he who was an
“ able Adviser of others to Fortitude and
“ Constancy, should, when his own Trial
“ came, sink under the Stroke of his Disasters.

“ See cap. iv. ver. 12. 34. Now when the
“ most grievous Trial of all was added to the
“ other Evils of this holy Person, to be con-
“ demned by his Friends as a Profligate and a
“ Hypocrite, and to be deprived, as much as
“ in them lay, of his only remaining Support,
“ the Testimony of a good Conscience,
“ what was left for the unhappy Man to do ?
“ He accuses his Friends of Perfidy and
“ Cruelty ; he calls upon God as the Witness
“ and Avenger of his Integrity : But when
“ neither God interposed to vindicate his In-
“ nocence, nor his Friends forbore to urge
“ their harsh Censures and unjust Accusations,
“ he appeals to that last Judgment in which,
“ with the utmost Confidence, he affirms
“ that he knew, his Redeemer would be
“ present to him, and that God would de-
“ clare in his Favour. But now, if the Hinge
“ of the Controversy had turned on this,
“ Whether or no, consistently with God’s Ju-
“ stice, good Men could be afflicted in this
“ Life, this Declaration ought to have finished
“ the Debate : But if the Question were con-
“ cerning the personal Innocence of *Job*, it
“ was no Wonder that they still sung their
“ old Song, and went on as they had begun,
“ to condemn their old afflicted Friend, since
“ it was in the Power of God alone to ex-
“ plore

“ plore the Hearts of Men, and to know for
“ certain whether it was *Job's* Piety that
“ rightly applied a Consolation, or whether it
“ was his Vanity that arrogated a false Con-
“ fidence to himself.

“ This Difficulty therefore being removed,
“ namely, why his Friends were not imme-
“ diately put to Silence when *Job* had so so-
“ lemnly and magnificently talked of a future
“ Judgment, nothing hinders us from apply-
“ ing that celebrated Text cap. xix. not to a
“ temporal Restitution to his former Condi-
“ tion, but to a Resurrection to eternal Life.
“ But if, to the Arguments brought by our
“ Commentator, you add also those, which a
“ Writer above all praise, the present bishop of
“ *Sarum*, hath most beautifully interwoven
“ in his Dissertation on *the Opinion of the An-*
“ *cients concerning the Circumstances and Con-*
“ *sequences of the Lapse of Mankind*, I believe
“ you will want nothing to confirm you in the
“ Opinion of the Antiquity of the Book, and
“ my Sense of this most perplexed Passage.”

Thus far the very candid and learned Writer ;
who will not be displeased with me for exa-
mining the Reasons he hath here offered against
my Explanation of the Book of *Job*.

He begins with saying, that *I have by many*
Arguments sufficiently specious, endeavour'd to
prove

prove that the whole Book of Job is dramatical and allegorical, yet founded in true History, and written by Eldra in Solace of the Jews, &c.

And then immediately subjoins, *Now in a Matter very uncertain, and which hitherto hath been made more uncertain by the different Opinions of learned Men, hardly any Hypothesis can be thought of which will satisfy in all its Parts.* Let us attend to the opening of his Cause.

1. He owns my *Hypothesis to be sufficiently specious*, and yet calls the Subject, which this *Hypothesis* explains, a *Matter very uncertain*; nay, *HITHERTO render'd more uncertain*—By what? why, if you will believe himself, by *many Arguments sufficiently specious*; for this is the Character he is pleased to give of these of mine, which fill up the Measure of those *different Opinions*, from whence so great *Uncertainty* is accumulated. 2. He says that *in an uncertain Matter scarce any Hypothesis can satisfy*. Now, tho' this be a common-place Thought, it is nevertheless a very false one. For it is only in *uncertain Matters* that *Hypothesis's* are invented, to be applied, to account for the Appearances of Things: And sure it is not of the *Nature* of an *Hypothesis* to be *unsatisfactory*? 3. It is equally false that an *uncertain Matter* is, otherwise than by Accident, *rendered more uncertain by Diversity of Opinions*. For the greater
the

the Diversity is, the greater is the Chance of coming to the Truth: As the more Roads Men take in an uncertain Way, the greater the Likelihood of finding out the Right. 4. It is not required in a *satisfactory* Hypothesis that it should *satisfy in all its Parts*: For then the greatest and most momentous Truths would never be acquiesced in, since some of the fundamental Points of Religion, natural and revealed, do not *satisfy in all their Parts*; there being inexplicable Objections even to *demonstrative* Propositions. 5. But what is strangest of all, though he says *hardly any Hypothesis can be thought of which will satisfy in all its Parts*; yet, before he comes to the end of his Paragraph, he has found one that does *satisfy*: and, stranger still, it is the *common* one, whose Incapacity of giving *Satisfaction* was the Reason for the Critics excogitating *so many different ones*. However, in this Hypothesis he rests, like a prudent Man as he is. *Therefore* (says he) *as I am of their Opinion who think the Book of Job the oldest in the Canon, so I am fully persuaded that it was written by Moses himself, who took it from authentic Records, and put it into the Dress of Poetry*. Indeed, to make Way thro' so much Doubt and Uncertainty, to an Opinion he may find his Account in, he has kept a Wicket open by the Insertion of the Particle *vix*; *vix ulla forsan Hypothesis* — but this will scarce serve his Purpose; For the Reasons why
hardly

hardly any Hypothesis can satisfy extend as well to *that* he has given as to those he has rejected: unless he will suppose the rest to be discredited by dissenting from *that*, and not *that* from the rest: which perhaps after all may be his Thought.

He proceeds—*And on this our Opinion a good Account may be given of all those Texts, if any such there be, wherein Allusion is made to the Jewish Law or History before the Book was written, no less than if we should allow it to have been written by Esdra, of whom the Learned think differently.* Now, not to insist upon this, that the *common Hypothesis*, here followed, which makes *Moses* the Author, supposes him to have wrote it *before* his Mission; and consequently, *before* the Jewish Law and Affairs, alluded to, were given and transacted: Not, I say, to insist on this, tho' no probable Reason can be assigned for *Moses's* Writing such a Work but for the People in *Captivity*; I will readily allow that *Moses* might write any Thing that happened to him or his People, in or before his Administration, as easily as *Esdra* could do. But the Question is, which of the two is most *likely* to have done so. Our Author grants this to be a Work of *Imitation*, or of the dramatic Kind; in which the Manners and Adventures of the Persons acting are to be represented. Now could *Moses* mistake, or, in such a Work, give

give without mistaking, the History of his own Time for the History of *Job's*? that is, make *Job* speak of the *Egyptian* Darkneſs, or the Paſſage of the Red Sea? Adventures of the Writer's own atchieving. *Eſdra* indeed either way might well do this, as he lived ſo many Ages after the Facts in Queſtion. Could *Euripides*, for Example, have been ſo abſurd as to make *Oreſtes* and *Clytæmneſtra* ſpeak of *his own* Time or Actions? Though he might, without much Abſurdity, have made them mix the Manners, or allude to ſome Adventures of the Time of *Draco*. But our Author's Caution deſerves Commendation; *if* (ſays he) *there be any ſuch*: The Uſe of this is evident, that if his own Solution will not hold, he may be at Liberty to deny the Thing itſelf. But what he means, by obſerving it, in Diſcredit of *Edra's* Claim, that *Learned Men think differently of him*, as if they did not think differently of *Moses* too, is, I confeſs, not ſo evident.

He goes on—*And as to thoſe Places, which in the Opinion of the Author of the D. L. refer to Hiſtories of later Times, ſuch as the Sickneſs and Recovery of Hezekiah, chap. xxxiii. ver. 25. and the Deſtruction of the Aſſyrian Army, chap. xxxiv. ver. 20. it will ſufficiently appear, by the Notes to which I refer the Reader, that there is no need to underſtand them in this Senſe, and that they are more commodiouſly underſtood otherwiſe.* On this Point I agree to join Iſſue with him, and to

refer myself to the Judgment of the Public.

Further, (says he) that the Work is dramatical, or, to speak more properly, a true History in the Form of a Drama, and adorned with a poetical Dress, was always my Opinion: but that any Allegory lies under it, I can by no Means persuade myself to believe; because not only the Age of the Writer, but the very Scope of the Book (as far as I can see) leads us to conclude otherwise. As to the Scope of the Book, we shall examine that Matter by and by: But his other Argument, from the Age of the Writer, deserves no Examination at all, as it is a downright begging the Question; which is concerning the Writer and his Age. Now these, by reason of the Writer's Silence, being uncertain, must be determined by the Subject and Circumstances of the Work, which are certain: For our Author, therefore, to disprove a Circumstance, brought to determine the Question, by an Argument in which the Question is taken for granted, I should think unfair, were it not become the authorized Logick of all those Writers who give their own Opinions for Principles. It rests then at last, we see, in his Belief and Persuasion: And this is always regulated on the Belief and Persuasion of those who went before. Thus he believes the Book to be dramatical, because others have believed so too: He believes it not to be allegorical, because he could find no other in that Belief before the Author

thor of the *D. L.*—But let us now hear what he has to say concerning *the Scope of the Book.*

For as to what this Writer [the Author of the D. L.] says, that the main Question handled in the Book of Job is whether Good happens to the Good, and Evil to evil Men, or whether both happen not promiscuously to both; and that this Question (a very foreign one to us, and therefore the less attended to) could never be the Subject of Disputation any where but in the Land of Judæa, nor there neither at any other time than that which he assigns; all this, I say, depends on the Truth of his Hypothesis, and is, in my Opinion, far otherwise. That which depends on the Truth of an Hypothesis has, indeed, generally speaking, a very slender Foundation: And I am partly of Opinion it was the common Prejudice against this Support that inclined our Author to give my Notions no better. But he should have been a little more careful in timing his Observation: For, as it happens, what I have shewn to be the Subject of the Book is so far from depending on the Truth of my Hypothesis, that the Truth of my Hypothesis depends on what I have shewn to be the Subject of the Book; and very fitly so, as every reasonable Hypothesis should be supported on Fact. Now I appeal to the whole learned World, whether it be not as clear a Fact that

the Subject of the Book of *Job* is *whether Good happens to the Good, and Evil to evil Men, or whether both happen not promiscuously to both*; as that the Subject of the first Book of *Tusculan Disputations* is *de contemnenda morte*. On this I established my Hypothesis, that the Book of *Job* must have been written about the Time of *Esdra*, because no other assignable Time can be suited to the Subject. — But 'tis possible I may mistake what he calls *my Hypothesis*: For ought I know he may understand not *that* of the Book of *Job*, but *that* of the Book of the *Divine Legation*. And then, by *my Hypothesis*, he must mean the great religious Principle I endeavour to evince, THAT THE JEWS WERE IN REALITY UNDER AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. But it will be paying me a very unusual Compliment to call *that* my Hypothesis which the Bible was written to testify; which all Christians *profess* to believe; and which none but Infidels *directly* deny. However, if this be the *Hypothesis* he means, I need desire no better a Support. But the Truth is, my Interpretation of the Book of *Job* seeks Support from nothing but those common Rules of Grammar and Logic on which the Sense of all kind of Writings

tings are or ought to be interpreted.

He goes on in this Manner. *For the sole Purpose of the sacred Writer seems to me to be this, to compose a Work that should remain a perpetual Document of Humility and Patience to all good Men in Affliction from this two-fold Consideration, as on the one hand of the infinite Perfection, Power, and Wisdom of God; so on the other; of human Corruption, Imbecillity, and Ignorance, discoverable even in the best of Men.* Such Talk in a Sermon to his Parish for the sake of a moral Application, might be right: But to speak thus to the *learned World*, is surely out of Season. The Critic will be apt tell to him he has mistaken the *Actor* for the *Subject*, and might on the same principle as well conclude that the purpose of *Virgil's* Poem is not the Establishment of an Empire in *Italy*, but the personal Piety of *Æneas*. But to be a little more explicite, as the peculiar Nature of this Work demands. The Book of *Job* consists of two distinct Parts; the *Narrative*, contained in the Prologue and Epilogue; and the *Argumentative*, which composes the Body of the Work. Now when the Question is of the Subject of a Book, who means other than the Body of it? Yet here our Author, by a strange Fatality, mistaking

king the *narrative* Part for the *argumentative*, gives us the Subject of the Introduction and Conclusion for that of the Work itself. And it is very true that the *beginning* and the *end* do exhibit a *perpetual Document of Humility and Patience to all good Men in Affliction*. But it is as true that the *Body* of the Work neither *does* nor *could* exhibit any such Document. First it *does not*; for, that Humility and Patience, which *Job* manifests before his entering into Dispute, is succeeded by Rage and Ostentation when he becomes heated with unreasonable Opposition. Secondly, it *could not*; because it is altogether *argumentative*; the Subject of which must necessarily be a *Proposition* debated, and not a *Document* exemplified. A *Precept* may be conveyed in History, but a Disputation can exhibit only a debated *Question*. I have shewn what that *Question* is; and he, instead of proving that I have assigned a wrong one, goes about to persuade the Reader, that there is no *Question* at all.

He proceeds. *For although in the Speeches that occur there be much Talk of Religion, Virtue, and Providence, of God's Wisdom, Justice, and Holiness in the Government of the World, of one Principle of all things, and other most important Truths,*

Truths, yet that this which I have assigned is the only Scope of the Book will appear manifest to every one, as well from the Beginning and the End as from the Oeconomy of the whole. For to say all in a word, it first presents Job complaining, expostulating, and indulging himself in an ungovernable Grief: but soon after (when as the Nature of the sacred Drama required, by the Contradiction of his Friends, and their sinister Suspicions, he became more and more teized and irritated) rashly challenging God, and glorying in his own Integrity: yet at length brought back to a due Submission and Knowledge of himself. The Reader now sees that all this is just as pertinent as if I should say, Mr. Chillingworth's famous Book against Knot was not to prove the Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation, but to give the Picture of an artful Caviler and a candid Disputer. For, altho', in the Arguments that occur, there be much Talk of Protestantism, Popery, Infallibility, a Judge of Controversies, Fundamentals of Faith, and other most important Matters, yet that this which I have assigned is the only Scope of the Book, will appear manifest to every one, as well from the beginning and the end, as from the Oeconomy of the whole. For it first of all presents the Sophist quibbling, chicaning, and indulging himself in all the imaginable
Methods

Methods of false Reasoning : And soon after, as the Course of Disputation required, resting on his own Authority, and loading his Adversary with personal Calumnies ; yet at length, by the Force of Truth and good Logic, brought back to the Point, confuted, exposed, and put to silence. Now if I should say this of the Book of *Chillingworth*, would it not be as true, and as much to the Purpose, as what our Author hath said of the Book of *Job*? The Matters in the Discourse of *the Religion of Protestants* could not be treated as they are without exhibiting the two Characters of a Sophist and a true Logician. Nor could the Matters in the Book of *Job* be treated as they are without exhibiting a good Man in Afflictions, complaining and expostulating, impatient under the Contradiction of his Friends, yet at length brought back to a due Submission, and Knowledge of himself. But therefore to make this the *sole* or *chief* Scope of the Book, (for in this he varies) is perverting all the Rules of Interpretation. But what misled him we have taken Notice of above. And he himself points to it, where he says, *the Subject I have assigned to the Book of Job appears the true both from the BEGINNING and the END.* It is true, he adds, and *from the Oeconomy of the whole likewise.*

Which

Which he endeavours to prove in this Manner :
For it first presents Job complaining, expostulating, and indulging himself in an ungovernable Grief: but soon after (when, as the Nature of the sacred Drama required, by the Contradiction of his Friends, and their sinister Suspicions, he became more and more teized and irritated) rashly challenging God, and glorying in his own Integrity: yet at length brought back to a due Submission and Knowledge of himself; and then at last, and not before, receiving from God both the Reward and Testimony of his Uprightness.
 This is indeed a fair Account of the Conduct of the Drama. And from this it appears, *first*, that that which he assigns for the sole Scope of the Book cannot be the true. For if its Design were to give a perpetual Document of *Humility and Patience*, how comes it to pass, that the Author, in the Execution of this Design, represents *Job complaining, expostulating, and indulging himself in an ungovernable Grief, rashly challenging God, and glorying in his own Integrity?* Could a Painter, think you, in order to represent the Ease and Safety of Navigation, draw a Vessel getting with much Pains and Difficulty into Harbour, after having lost all her Lading and been miserably torn and shattered by a Tempest? And yet you think a Writer, in order to give a *Document of Humility,*

H

lity and Patience, had sufficiently discharged his Plan if he made *Job* conclude *resigned and submissive*, tho' he had drawn him turbulent, impatient, and almost blasphemous throughout the whole Piece. *Secondly*, it appears from the learned Author's Account of the Conduct of the Drama, that that which I have assigned for the sole Scope of the Book is the true. For if, in *Job's* distressful Circumstance, the Question concerning an *equal* or *unequal* Providence were to be debated: His Friends, if if they held the former Part, must *needs* doubt of his Integrity; this doubt would naturally provoke *Job's* Indignation; and, when persisted in, cause him to fly out into the intemperate Excesses so well described by our Author; yet conscious Innocence would at length enable Patience to do its Office, and the conclusive Argument for his Integrity would be his Resignation and Submission.

The learned Writer shuts up the Argument thus. *From all this, I say it appears, that the personal Integrity of Job, and not the Question concerning an equal or unequal Providence is the principal Subject of the Book.* He had before only told us his *Opinion*; and now, from his *Opinion*, he says it *appears*. But Appearances we see are deceitful; as indeed they will always be, when they arise only out of the Fancy
or

or Inclination, and not from the real nature of things.

But he proceeds to push his Advantages. For that [i. e. his personal Integrity] it was which his Friends doubted of, not so much on account of his Affliction, as for the not bearing his Affliction with Patience, but complaining of the Justice of God. And that he, who was an able Adviser of others to Fortitude and Constancy, should, when his own Trial came, sink under the Stroke of his Disasters. — But why not on account of his Afflictions? Do not we find that even now, under this unequal Distribution of Things, censorious Men (and such doubtless he will confess Job's Comforters to have been) are but too apt to suspect great Afflictions for the Punishment of secret Sins. How much more prone to the same Suspicion would such men be in the Time of Job, when the Ways of Providence were more equal? As to his Impatience in bearing Affliction, that Symptom was altogether ambiguous, and might as likely denote want of Fortitude as want of Innocence, and proceed as well from the Pain of an ulcerated Body as the Anguish of a distracted Conscience.

Well, our Author has brought the Patriarch thus far on his Way to expose his *bad Temper*. From hence he accompanies him to his Place

of Rest; which, he makes to be in a *bad Argument*. — Now when (says the learned Writer) the most grievous Trial of all was added to the other Evils of this holy Person, to be condemned by his Friends as a Profligate, and an Hypocrite, and to be deprived as much as in them lay, of his only remaining Support, the Testimony of a good Conscience, what was left for the unhappy Man to do? He accuses his Friends of Perfidy and Cruelty; he calls upon God as the Witness and Avenger of his Integrity: But when neither God interposed to vindicate his Innocence, nor his Friends forbore to urge their harsh Censures and unjust Accusations, he appeals to that last Judgment, in which with the utmost Confidence he affirms that he knew that his Redeemer would be present to him, and that God would declare in his Favour. To understand the Force of this Representation, we must have in Mind this unquestionable Truth: “ That be
“ the Subject of the Book what it will, yet if
“ the sacred Writer bring in the Persons of
“ the Drama disputing, he will take Care
“ that they talk to the Purpose.” Now we both agree that Job’s Friends had pretended to suspect his Integrity. This Suspicion it was Job’s Business to remove; and, if our Author’s Account of the Subject be true, his only Business. To this end he offers various
rious

rious Arguments, which failing of their Effect, he, at last, (as our Author will have it) appeals to the second Coming of the Redeemer of Mankind. But was this likely to satisfy them? They demand a present Solution of their Doubts, and he sends them to a future Judgment. Nor can our Author *say*, though he would *insinuate*, that this was such a sort of Appeal as Disputants are sometimes forced to have Recourse to, when they are run aground and have nothing more to offer: For *Job*, after this, proceeds in the Dispute; and urges many other Arguments with the utmost Propriety. Indeed there is one way, and but one, to make the Appeal pertinent: And that is, to suppose our Author *mistaken*, when he said that *the personal Integrity of Job, and not the Question concerning an equal or unequal Providence, was the main Subject of the Book*: And we may venture to suppose so without much danger of doing him wrong: For, the Doctrine of a *future Judgment* affords a Principle whereon to determine the *Question of an equal or unequal Providence*; but it leaves the *personal Integrity of Job* just as it found it. But the learned Author is so little solicitous for the *Pertinency* of the Argument, that he makes, as we shall now see, its *Impertinence* one of the great Supports of his System. For thus he goes on:
But

But now if the Hinge of the Controversy had turned on this, whether or no, consistently with God's Justice, good Men could be afflicted in this Life, this Declaration ought to have finished the Debate : but if the Question were concerning the personal Innocence of Job, it was no wonder that they still sung their old Song, and went on as they had begun, to condemn their old afflicted Friend ; since it was in the Power of God alone to explore the Hearts of Men, and to know for certain whether it was Job's Piety that rightly applied a Consolation, or whether it was his Vanity that arrogated a false Confidence to himself. This is a very pleasant Way of coming to the Sense of a disputed Passage : Not, as of old, by shewing it supports the *Writer's Argument*, but by shewing it supports nothing but the *Critic's Hypothesis*. I had taken it for granted that Job reasoned to the Purpose, and therefore urged this Argument against understanding him as speaking of the Resurrection in the xixth Chapter. “ The
 “ Disputants (say I, *Div. Leg.* Vol. ii. Ed. 2.
 “ p. 546.) are all equally imbarassed in ad-
 “ justing the Ways of Providence. Job af-
 “ firms that the good Man is sometimes un-
 “ happy, the three Friends pretend that he
 “ never can; because such a Situation would
 “ reflect upon God's Justice. Now the Doc-
 “ trine

“ trine of a *Resurrection* supposed to be urged
“ by *Job* cleared up all this Embarras. If
“ therefore his Friends thought it true, it ended
“ the Dispute ; if false, it lay upon them
“ to confute it. Yet they do neither : They
“ neither call it into question, nor allow it to
“ be decisive. But without the least Notice
“ that any such thing had been urged, they
“ go on as they begun, to inforce their former
“ Arguments, and to confute that which
“ they seem to understand was the only one
“ *Job* had urged against them, viz. the Consciousness
“ of his own Innocence.” Now what says our learned Author to this ?
Why, he says, that if I be mistaken, and he
right, in his Account of the Book of *Job*, the
Reason is plain why the three Friends took no
Notice of *Job*’s Appeal to a Resurrection ;
namely, because it deserved none. As to
his being in the *Right*, the Reader, I suppose,
will not be greatly solicitous, if it be one
of the Consequences that the sacred Reasoner
is in the *Wrong*. However, before we allow
him to be right, it will be expected he should
answer the following Questions. If, as he
says, the Point in the Book of *Job* was *only*
his personal Innocence, and this, not (as I say)
upon the Principle of no innocent Person punished,
I would ask how it was possible that
Job’s

Job's Friends and Intimates should be so obstinately bent on pronouncing him guilty, the Purity of whose former Life and Conversation they were so well acquainted with? If he will say, the Disputants went *upon that Principle*, I then ask how came *Job's* Appeal to a Resurrection not to silence his Opposers? as it accounted for the Justice of God in the present unequal Distribution of Things.

The learned Writer proceeds — *This Difficulty therefore being removed, namely, why his Friends were not immediately put to silence when Job had so solemnly and magnificently talked of a future Judgment, nothing hinders us from applying that celebrated Text chap. xix. not to a temporal Restitution to his former Condition, but to a Resurrection to eternal Life.* How well he has removed the *Difficulty*, the Reader now sees. But he is too hasty, when he adds, that *now nothing hinders us from applying that celebrated Text chap. xix. to a Resurrection to eternal Life.* I have shewn, in my Discourse on *Job*, that many Things *binder* us from understanding it in this Sense, besides the Silence of the three Friends; such as the Silence of *Elibu* the Moderator, nay even of God himself the Determiner of the Dispute * Which

* See Div. Leg. Vol. ii. Ed. 2. p. 548.

Difficulties become still more perplexing, if indeed the *sole Scope* of the Book be, as our Author supposes, to give a *perpetual Document of Humility and Patience to all good Men in Affliction*: For then the Doctrine needed the Sanction of the most deliberate and authoritative Speakers. Add to this, that the learned Writer's Account of the *Author* creates new Difficulties. For can we suppose, *Moses* would so clearly mention a *future Judgment* here, and entirely omit it in the *Pentateuch*? Or is it a Matter of so slight Moment that a single Mention of it would suffice? Indeed, were *Esdra* (as I suppose) the Author, much more might be said in behalf of this Interpretation; as we have shewn that the later Prophets opened, by degrees, the great Principles of the Gospel Dispensation: Of which I would fain think the Doctrine of the *Resurrection of the Body* to be one.

He concludes,—*But if, to the Arguments brought by our Commentator, you add also those, which a Writer above all Praise, the present Bishop of Sarum hath most beautifully interwoven in his Dissertation on The Opinion of the Ancients concerning the Circumstances and Consequences of the Lapse of Mankind, I believe you will want nothing to confirm you in the Opinion of the Antiquity of the Book, and*

my Sense of this most perplexed Passage. To seek refuge in that excellent Prelate, whose Notions of the Nature and Design of the Book of *Job* overthrow all he has been saying, and confirm all he has been opposing, looks very much like Distress. However, if he will submit to the Bishop's Authority for the Scope of the Book in general, I shall be very willing to allow his Interpretation of the *nineteenth* Chapter. Our Author indeed does that great Man's Character but Justice. Yet how Dr. *Schultens* and Dr. *Sherlock* came to hit the same Palate, to me, I confess, is as hard to reconcile, as how *Bavius* and *Virgil* should meet for a Model to the same Writer.

But the Name of that great Man is *auspicious* to sacred Truth. One can no sooner mention him, on any Occasion of Literature, than one sees him pointing out some Truth or other, capable, if attended to, of clearing up whatever may be in question. His fine Discourse on the Book of *Job* abounds with Instances of this kind. One of which falls here naturally in my Way. And as it seems the least supported of his Interpretations, and, at the same time, greatly confirms what I have advanced concerning the *Age* of the Book, I shall endeavour to set it in a just Light. The *Truth* I mean is in his Interpretation of these
Words

Words of Job, *By his Spirit the Heavens are garnished; his Hand formed the CROOKED SERPENT*^a. By which, he supposes, is meant the DEVIL, the apostate Dragon, δράκων ἀποστάτης, as the Septuagint, by thus translating it, seems to have understood the Place. For he reasonably asks, *How came the forming of a crooked Serpent to be mentioned as an Instance of Almighty Power, and to be set, as it were, upon an equal Foot with the Creation of the Heavens and all the Host of them.—Can it possibly be imagined* (says he) *that the forming the crooked Serpent means no more than that God created Snakes and Adders*^b. Certainly, this could never be the meaning. But then it will be objected by those who are as loth to find a Devil for their Tempter, as a God for their Redeemer, (imagining they are well capable of performing both Parts themselves) that, by the crooked Serpent, is meant a great Constellation near the arctic Pole, so called; or, at least, that enormous Trail of Light to which the Pagans have given the Name of the *Via Lactea*: either of which will beautify the Sense, and enoble the Expression of the Context; the Circumstance, of garnishing the Heavens,

^a Cap. xxvi. v. 13.

^b The Use and Intent of Prophecy, &c. 3d Edit. p. 213.
214.

being immediately, precedent. It must be owned that this Interpretation has an extreme Air of Probability. But it is nevertheless a false one; as I shall now endeavour to shew.

It is certain then that the ancient *Hebrews*, (if we may believe the Rabbins, who seem, in this case, to be unexceptionable Evidence) did not, in their Astronomy, represent the Stars, either single, or in Constellations, by the Name, or Figure, of any Animal whatsoever; or distinguish them any otherwise than by the Letters of their Alphabet artificially applied. And this, they tell us, was their constant Practice, till in the latter Ages; when they got acquainted with the Science of the *Greeks*: then indeed, they learnt the Art of new tricking up their *Sphere*, and making it as fashionable as their Neighbours. But they did it still with Modesty and Reserve; and scrupled, even then, to admit of any human Figure. The Reason given for this Prudery (which was *the Danger of Idolatry*) is the highest Confirmation of the Truth of their Account. For it is not to be believed, that when the *Astronomy* and *Superstition* of *Egypt* were so closely collegued, and that by this very means, the *Names* given to the Constellations, that *Moses*, who, under the Ministry of God, forbid the *Israelites* to make any
Likeness

Likeness of any thing in Heaven above, would suffer them to make *new Likenesses* there: which if not, in the first Intention, set up to be worshipped, yet we know never waited long without obtaining that Honour. From all this it appears, that neither *Moses* nor *Esdra* could call a Constellation by the Name of the *crooked Serpent*. The Consequence is, that his Lordship's Interpretation is to be received; there being nothing else of Moment to be opposed to its Truth. But this Sense, we say, gives strong Support to what we have observed, in the *Divine Legation*, concerning the Age of the Author. It being there shewn ^c that, according to the Method used by Providence for the gradual Opening of the Gospel Principles, we might look to find, in this very Place, (as we in fact do find) the *first* more express Information concerning the *real* Author of the Fall of Man, as recorded in the *third* Chapter of *Genesis*.

But, to conclude with the learned Editor of the Book of *Job*. He had, I presume, given the intelligent Reader more Satisfaction, if, instead of labouring to evade two or three independent tho' corroborating Proofs of the *Truth* of my Hypothesis, he had well accounted how that

^c See the *Div. Leg.* vol. ii. Edit. 2. p. 530. & seq. .

Hypothesis, which he affects to represent as a *false* one, should be able to lay open and unfold the whole Poem upon one entire, elegant, and noble Plan, that does honour to the sacred Writer who compos'd it. And not only so, but to clear up, consistently with that *Plan*, all those particular Texts, whose Want of Light had made them hitherto an easy Prey to Critics and Interpreters from every Quarter. And this, in a Poem become thro' Time and Negligence so desperately perplex'd, that Commentators chose rather find their own Notions in it than to seek for those of the Author. This, how negligently soever the learned Writer may think of it, the Public, I am persuaded, will consider as a very uncommon Mark of Truth; and deserving of another kind of Confutation than what he hath bestowed upon it.

S E C T. V.

See *Div. Leg.* Vol. i. and ii.

HERE I should have ended had I not been told, there was something still more wanted than a Defence of particular Passages; which commonly indeed carry their own Evidence along with them; and That was a general Review of the Argument of the *Divine Legation*

Legation, so far as it was yet advanced; explaining the Relation which the several Parts bear to each other, and to the whole: For that the deep Professor who had digested his Theology into *Sums* and *Systems*, and the gentle Preacher who never ventured to let a Thought expatiate beyond the Limits of a *Pulpit Essay*, would join to tell me, I had promised to DEMONSTRATE THE DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES; and that now, I had written two large Volumes with that Title, all that they could find in them were Discourses on the *Foundation of Morality*; the *Origin of civil and religious Society*; the *Alliance between Church and State*; the *Policy of ancient Lawgivers*; the *Mysteries of the Priests*, and the *Opinions of the Greek Philosophers*; the *Antiquity of Egypt*, their *Hieroglyphics*, their *Heroes*, and their *Brutal-Worship*. That, indeed, at last, I speak a little of the *Jewish Policy*, but I soon break away again as from a Subject I would avoid; and employ the remaining Part of the Volume on the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, the *Book of Job*, and on *primary and secondary Prophecies*. But what, say they, is all this to the DIVINE LEGATION of MOSES?

Dic, Postkume! de tribus Capellis.

—Ta

—To call the *Notion* a PARADOX was very well: But not to see that I had attempted to prove it, must be owned to be still better. I was aware of this Complaint, because I knew with whom I had to do; and therefore, in the Entry of my second Volume, was willing that CICERO, who had been in the like Circumstance himself, should speak for me ^d.

But (as it proved) to little Purpose. The Greatness of his Authority, and the Docility of his Readers, which made a few Words sufficient in his Case, were both wanting in mine. So that I soon found myself under a Necessity of speaking for *myself*, or rather, for my *Argument*. Which as it was drawn out to an uncommon Length, and raised upon a great Variety of Supports, sought out from every Quarter of Antiquity, and sometimes from the most remote and darkeſt, it was the leſs to be admired if every *candid* Reader ſhould not ſee their full Force and various Purpose; and ſtill leſs, if

^d Video hanc primam ingreſſionem meam non ex Oratoris diſputationibus ductam, ſed e mediâ Philoſophiâ repetitam, & eam quidem cum antiquam tum ſubobſcuram, aut *reprehenſionis* aliquid, aut certe *admirationis* habituram. Nam aut mirantur *quid hæc pertineant ad ea quæ quærimus*: quibus ſatisfaciet res ipſa cognita, ut non ſine cauſa alte repetita videatur: aut reprehendent, *quod inuſitatas vias indagemus, tritas relinquamus*. Ego autem me ſæpe nova videre dicere intelligo cum pervetera dicam, ſed inaudita plerique. *Cicero*.

the

the *Envious* and *Prejudiced* should concur to represent it as an inconnected Heap of Discourses put together to disburthen a Common-place. For the Satisfaction therefore of the *former*, I shall endeavour to expose, in one clear and simple Light, the whole Conduct of these *mysterious* Volumes.

Nor should the *latter* be neglected. Tho' 'tis odds but we part as dissatisfied with one another, as *Bertrand* and his Customer. Of whom the Story goes, that a grave well dressed Man, coming to the Shop of that ingenious Inventer and Reliever of the Distresses of all those who are too dull to know what they want, and too rich to be at Ease with what they have, demanded one of his best Reading-Glasses; which when he had examined upon all Sorts of Print, he returned back with solemn Assurance that he could not read at all in it. *Bertrand*, when he had recovered from the Surprise of so strange a Phenomenon, fairly asked him, *Sir, could you ever read at all?* To which the other as fairly replied, *Had I been so happy I had not come hither for your Assistance.* Should I not therefore, with the same Forecast, have asked these People, "Gentlemen, before I put my Argument for you in a new Light, pray tell me, do you understand an Argument in

K

" any

“ any Light at all?” But would they have answered with the same Ingenuity? They are silent. They modestly let their *Works* speak for them. To go on, therefore, with our Subject.

In reading the *Law* and *History* of the *Jews*, with all the Attention I was able, amongst the many very singular Circumstances of that amazing Dispensation (from each of which, as I conceive, the *Divinity* of its Original may be clearly deduced) these two Particulars more forcibly struck my Observation, *First*, the *Omission of the Doctrine of a future State* of Rewards and Punishments in the Religion of that People; no Instance of the like Nature being to be found throughout the whole History of Mankind: In all the infinite Variety of Gentile Religions this Doctrine ever making a principal and most essential Part. *The other* was no less singular, that the Founder of this Religion should pretend *his Dispensation was to be administered by an extraordinary Providence*; that his Laws should have all one constant Direction pursuant to this Pretence; and that the succeeding Writers of the Jewish History should all concur in the same Representation: No Lawgiver or Founder of Religion ever promising the like Distinction; and

and no Historian ever daring to record so singular a Prerogative.

As unaccountable as the *former* Circumstance appeared, when considered separately and alone, yet when set against the *latter*, and their Relations to each other examined, one illustrious Reason of the *Omission of the Doctrine of a future State* was not only immediately perceived, but, from that very *Omission*, the *Divinity* of the Jewish Religion clearly demonstrated. Which, as Unbelievers had been long accustomed to decry from that very Circumstance, I chose *that* preferably to all other, as a Proof of the DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES. The Argument is, in a supreme Degree strong and simple; and not needing many Words to make it understood.

I. *Religion*, such as teaches a God, the Rewarder of Good, and the Punisher of evil Actions, is absolutely necessary for the Support of *Civil Society*: Because human Laws alone are not sufficient to restrain Men from Evil in any degree necessary for the carrying on the Affairs of public Regiment. But the *Inequality* of Events here below shaking the Belief of that *Providence* on which all Religion must be founded, (for *he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them who diligently seek him*) there was no

other Way of supporting and re-establishing that Belief than by the Doctrine of a *future State*, wherein all these Inequalities should be set even, and every Action receive *its due Recompence of Reward*. The Doctrine therefore of a *future State* is immediately necessary to Religion; and, thro' that, ultimately to civil Society. Yet, here we find a Religion without a *future State*, professed with great Advantage thro' many Ages by a civil-policed, and powerful People. It appears, from what has been said above, that, under the common Dispensations of Providence, *such* a Religion would be so far from supporting Society, that it could not even subsist itself. We must conclude, therefore, that the *Jewish People* were, as their Founder and their Historians pretended, *indeed* under the Dispensation of an extraordinary Providence.

II. Again, it appears from the universal *Practice* of the ancient *Lawgivers*, and the *Principles* of the ancient *Sages*, that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was esteemed thus necessary to Religion and Society, under the common Dispensations of Providence. The *Egyptian* Policy and Wisdom particularly, from whence those *Lawgivers* and *Sages* borrowed *theirs*, cultivated this Doctrine, for these Ends, with an amazing Assiduity. Now
Moses

Moses, who, as we are assured by the infallible Testimony of the holy Spirit, was *learned in all the Wisdom of the Egyptians*, and whose Laws themselves, as the Deist confesses, bespeak him a consummate Master in his Art; this *Moses*, I say, when instituting a *new Religion*, and forming an *uncivilized People* to Society, hath been so far from inculcating the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, that he hath even *omitted* to make the least Mention of it. Who sees not then that one Reason of the *Omission* must needs be, that this wise Lawgiver understood, his Religion and Policy might well subsist without it? But, under the common Dispensations of Providence, his Principles of *Egyptian Wisdom* had taught him, that neither one nor the other could do so. What therefore are we to conclude, but that he himself was fully convinced of the *Truth* of what he taught his Countrymen, *That they were thenceforward to live under the extraordinary Providence of God.*

These *two Proofs* of my MAIN PROPOSITION, from the *Thing omitted*, and the *Person omitting* (which as they are distinct and independent of one another, so I would desire the Reader to observe that they are either of them *alone* sufficient to establish my Demonstration) may be reduced to these two SYLLOGISMS.

I. What-

I. Whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State for their Support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence.

The Jewish Religion and Society had no future State for their Support.

Therefore the Jewish Religion and Society were supported by an extraordinary Providence.

Again, II. It was universally believed by the Ancients, on their common Principles of Legislation and Wisdom, that whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State for their Support must be supported by an extraordinary Providence.

Moses, skilled in all that Legislation and Wisdom, instituted the *Jewish* Religion and Society without a future State for its Support.

Therefore *Moses* who taught, believed likewise, that *this* Religion and Society were to be supported by an extraordinary Providence.

This is the grand PARADOX I have been accused of advancing: In the mean while, the *Free-thinker* esteems it *none* to contradict the universal Voice of Antiquity; nor the *System-maker*, to explain away the whole Letter of sacred Scripture. For had not Libertines denied

denied the MAJOR Propositions of these two *Syllogisms*; and certain Bigotted-believers, the MINOR, my Demonstration of the *Divine Legation of Moses* had not only been as *strong*, but as *short* too as any of *Euclid's*: whose *Theorems*, as *Hobbes* somewhere truly observes, were but the Passions and Prejudices of Men equally concerned in, would soon be made as much matter of Dispute as any *moral* or *theological* Proposition whatsoever.

It was not long then before I found that the Discovery of this important Truth would engage me in a full Dilucidation of my *four Propositions*: Neither a short, nor an easy Task. The *two first* requiring a severe Search into the civil Policy, Religion, and Philosophy of ancient Times: and the *two latter*, a minute Enquiry concerning the Nature and Genius of the *Jewish* Constitution. To the *first* part of this Enquiry, therefore, I assigned the *first* Volume; and to the *other*, the *second*.

I.

I. The FIRST Volume begins with proving the MAJOR Proposition of the *first Syllogism*, that *whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State for their Support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence*. Where it is shewn, that *Civil Society*, which was in-

stituted as a Remedy against *Force* and *Injustice*, falls short in many Instances, of its Effect; as it cannot, by its own proper Force, provide for the Observance of above one *third* Part of *moral* Duties; and, of that third, but *imperfectly*: and, which is still of greater Importance, that it totally wants the *first* of those two Powers, *Reward* and *Punishment*, which are owned by all to be the necessary Hinges on which Government turns, and without which it cannot be carried on. To supply which Wants and Imperfections, some other coactive Power, was to be added. This Power is shewn to be *Religion*; which teaching the *Providence* and *Justice* of the Deity, provides for all the natural Deficiencies of *civil Society*. But then, those *Attributes*, as we shew, can be supported only by the Doctrine of a *future State* of Rewards and Punishments; or by a present Dispensation of Things very different from that which we experience to be here administered.

The Point being thus proved, the Discourse proceeds in removing *Objections*. The Reader observes, that the Steps and Gradations of this great Truth rise thus.—A *future State* is necessary as it supports *Religion*; *Religion* is necessary as it supports *Morality*; and *Morality*, as it supports *Society*. Hence I concluded the Doctrine

trine of a *future State* to be necessary to Society. Now there are various degrees in *Libertinism*. Some, tho' they own *Morality*, yet deny *Religion*, to be necessary to Society : Others again, go still further, and deny even *Morality* to be necessary. As these equally attempt to break the Chain of my Reasoning, they come equally under my Examination. And luckily, in the *first* Instance, a great Name ; and in the *second*, a great Book invited me to this Entertainment. 1. The famous Mr. *Bayle* had attempted to prove that *Religion* was not necessary to Society ; that *Morality*, as distinguished from Religion, might well supply its Place ; and that an ATHEIST might have this *Morality*. His Arguments in Support of these Propositions I have examined at large. And having Occasion, when I come to the last of them, to enquire into the *true Foundation of Morality*, I consider all its Pretences ; inquire into all its Advantages ; and shew that *Obligation*, properly so called, proceeds from *Will*, and *Will only*. This Enquiry was *directly* to my Point, as the Result of it proves that the *Morality* of the Atheist must be without any true Foundation, and consequently weak and easily shaken. Yet it had a further Propriety, as the Religion, whose divine Original I was here attempting to

L demon-

demonstrate, has founded moral Obligation in *Will only*; and a peculiar Expediency, as it is become the Humour of the Times to seek far this *Foundation* in any thing rather than in what *Religion* places it. 2. But the Author of the *Fable of the Bees* went a large Step further, and endeavoured to prove that *Morality* was so far from being necessary to Society, that, on the contrary, it was Vice, not Virtue, which rendered States flourishing and happy. This pernicious Doctrine, which would cut away our Argument by the Root, was enforced with much labour'd Art and plausible Insinuation. I undertook therefore to examine and confute the Principles it went upon: which, I presume, to have done so effectually, as will secure the Reader from the Danger of being any longer misled by it. In this manner I endeavoured to prove the MAJOR Proposition of the *first* Syllogism: and, with this, the *first* Book of the *Divine Legation of Moses* concludes.

II. The *second* begins with proving the MAJOR Proposition of the *second* Syllogism, that *It was universally believed by the Ancients, on their common Principles of Legislation and Wisdom, that whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State for their Support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence.* This

Proof

Proof divides itself into *two Parts*, the *Conduct of the Lawgivers*, and the *Opinion of the Philosophers*. The *first Part* is examined in the *present Book*, and the *second* in the *following*.

In proving the Proposition from the *Conduct of the Lawgivers*, I shew, I. their Care to PROPAGATE, First, *Religion in general*,
 1. As it appears from the *Reason of Things*, viz. the State of Religion all over the civilized World. 2. As it appears from *Fact*, such as their universal Pretence to *Inspiration*; which, it is shewn, was made only to establish the Opinion of the Superintendency of the Gods over human Affairs: And such as their universal Practice in the manner of *Prefacing* their Laws; where the same Superintendency was taught and inculcated. And here I desire it may be observed, that the proving their Care to propagate *Religion in general*, proves, at the same time, their propagating the Doctrine of a *future State*; because there never was any Religion in the World but the *Jewish*, of which that Doctrine did not make an essential Part. I shew, Secondly, their Care to propagate the *Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in particular*. And, as the most effectual Method they employed to this Purpose was the Institution of the MY-

STERIES, I give a large Account of their Rise and Progress; which I shew to have been from *Egypt* into *Greece*. The Detection of the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ of these *Mysteries*, which were the *Unity of the Godhead*, and the *Error of the grosser Polytheism*, not only confirms all that is advanced concerning the Rise, Progress, and Order of the several Species of Idolatry, but rectifies and clears up much Embarrass and Mistake even in the best modern Critics, such as *Cudworth*, *Prideaux*, *Newton*, &c. while they ventured, contrary to the Tenure of holy Scripture, to suppose that the *One God* was commonly known and worshipped in the Pagan World. For finding many, in divers Countries, speaking of the one God, they concluded he must needs have a national Worship paid to him; tho' the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, represent the Gentiles in a total Ignorance of the true God, and entirely given up to Polytheism. This, as we say, has occasioned much Confusion and Mistake in our best Writers on this Subject, while they would reconcile their own Conclusions to Scripture Premises. Now the Discovery of the ἀπόρρητα of the *Mysteries*, enables us to explain the perfect Consistency between sacred and profane Antiquity; which,
left

left to speak for themselves, and without Interpreters, inform us of this plain and consistent Truth, “ That the Doctrine of the
 “ one God was taught in all Places, as a profound Secret to a few in the Celebration of
 “ their mysterious Rites ; but that a public or
 “ *national Worship* was paid to him no where
 “ but in the Land of *Judæa*.” Where, as *Eusebius* well expresses it, *for the Hebrew PEOPLE alone was reserved the Honour of being initiated into the Knowledge of the Creator of all Things*. And, of this Difference, God himself speaks, by the Prophet, *I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the Earth ; I said not unto the Seed of Jacob seek ye me in vain*^f. And the holy Apostle informs us of the Consequence of this mysterious Manner of teaching the true God, that when, by this means, they came to the Knowledge of him, *they glorified him not as God*^g. To confirm my Account of the Mysteries, I subjoin a critical Dissertation on the *sixth Book of Virgil’s Æneis* ; and another, on the *Metamorphosis of Apuleius*. The *first* of which I prove to be one continued *Description* of the *Mysteries* ;

^f Isaiah, xlv. 19.

^g Romans, i. 21.

and

and the *second*, to be written purposely to *recommend* their Use and Efficacy. But by Mischance (and the only one of this kind in the two Volumes) the Dissertation on *Apuleius* is misplaced. The Reader will observe that, thro' the Course of this whole Argument, on the Conduct of the ancient Lawgivers, it appears that all the fundamental Principles of their Policy were borrowed from EGYPT. A Truth that will be made greatly subservient to the *Minor* of my *second* Syllogism (that *Moses was skilled in all the ancient Legislation and Wisdom, and yet instituted the Jewish Religion and Society without a future State for its Support*) as well when I prove the *latter* Part of the Proposition in the *second* Volume, as the *former* Part, in the *Third*; where the Character of *Moses* is vindicated from the Objections of Infidelity. From this, and from what has been said above of *moral Obligation*, the intelligent Reader will take notice, that, throughout the *Divine Legation*, I have all along endeavour'd to select for my Purpose such kind of Arguments, in Support of the *particular* Question in hand, as may, at the same time, either illustrate the Truth of *Revelation in general*, or serve as a Principle to proceed upon in the *Progress of the Argument*. Of which we shall give, as

occa-

occasion serves, several further Instances in the Course of this *Review*.

Thus, having shewn the Legislator's Care to *propagate* Religion in general, and the Doctrine of a future State in particular, (in which is seen their Sense of the inseparable Connection between them) I go on, II. To explain the Contrivances they employed to PERPETUATE them: By which it may appear that, in their Opinion, *Religion* was not a temporary Expedient to secure their own Power, but a necessary Support of Civil Government. I. The first Instance of their Care to this End was, as we shew, the ESTABLISHING every where a *national Religion protected by the Laws of the State*. But Men ignorant of true Religion could hardly avoid falling into Mistakes in the *Mode* of this *Establishment*; pursuing a right End by very wrong Means: Therefore, as the Subject of our Book is no idle unconcerning Speculation, but such as affects us in all our highest Interests as Men and Citizens, I thought a Defence of the Justice and Equity of an ESTABLISHED RELIGION would well deserve the Reader's best Attention; and this I have given him, in an Explanation of the true *Theory* of the *Alliance between Church and State*. 2. The second

cond Expedient the Legislator used for *perpetuating* Religion, I shew was the Allowance of a GENERAL TOLERATION, which, as it would, for the same Reason, be as wrongly conceived as an *Establishment*, I have attempted to give the true *Theory* of that likewise. Where, speaking of the Cause and first Occasion of its Violation, the Subject naturally led me to vindicate true Religion from the Aspersions of Infidelity. And here I shew that the first Persecution for Religion was not *that* which was *committed*, but *that* which was *undergone*, by the Christian Church. And thus ends the *second* Book of the *Divine Legation*.

III. The *Third* begins with the *latter Part* of the Proof of the MAJOR Proposition of the *second* Syllogism; namely, *the Opinions of the Philosophers*. For as the great Waste of Time hath destroyed most of the Monuments of ancient *Legislation*, I thought it proper to strengthen my Position, of the Sense of their Lawgivers, by that of their Sages and Philosophers. Where I shew *first*, from their own Words, the Sense they had in general of the Necessity of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments to civil Society. But to set the Fact in the strongest Light, I *next* endeavour to prove, that even those of
them,

them (namely, the several Sects of *Grecian* Philosophers) who did not believe this future State, yet, for the Sake of Society, sedulously taught and propagated it. That they taught it, is confessed. That they did not believe it, was my Business to prove. Which I first do, by the three following *general* Reasons. 1. That they all thought it allowable to say one Thing and think another. 2. That they perpetually practised what they thus professed to be lawful. And 3. That they practised it with regard to the very Doctrine in Question. To explain and verify the two first of these Propositions, I had Occasion to enquire into the Rise, Progress, Perfection, Decline, and Genius of the ancient *Greek* Philosophy under all its several Divisions. In which, as its Rise and Genius are shewn to have been from *Egypt*, we lay in a still further Support for the *minor* Proposition of the *second* Syllogism.

The Discourse then proceeds to a *particular* Enquiry into the Sentiments of *each* Sect of Philosophy on this Point. Where it is shewn, from the *Character* and *Genius* of each School, and from the *Writings* of each Man, that none of them did indeed believe the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. But, from almost every Argument brought for this Purpose, it, at the

M

same

same time, appears of how high Importance they *all* thought it to Society.

Further, to support this Fact, I prove next, that these Philosophers not only *did not*, but *could not* possibly, believe the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, because it contradicted two metaphysical Principles universally held and believed by them concerning the Nature of God and of the SOUL; which were, that *God could not be angry nor hurt any one*; and that *the Soul was Part of God, and resolvable again into him*. In explaining, and *verifying the Reception* of this latter Principle, I take Occasion to speak of its Original; which I shew was *Grecian*, and not *Egyptian*, as appears from the different Genius and Character of the two Philosophies; tho' the spurious Books going under the Name of *Hermes*, but indeed written by late *Greek* Platonists, would persuade us to believe the contrary. The use of *this Enquiry* likewise (concerning *the Origin of this Principle*) will be seen when we come to clear up the *Character* of *Moses* as aforesaid. But with regard to the general Question, (concerning *the Belief of the Philosophers*) besides the direct and principal use of it for the Support of the MAJOR Proposition of the *second Syllogism*, it has, (as I said before I had contrived my Arguments

ments should have) two further uses ; the one to serve as a Principle in the Progress of my Argument ; the other to illustrate the Truth of Revelation in general. For, 1. It will serve for a sufficient Answer to that Objection of the Deists, to be considered in the last Volume, that *Moses did not propagate the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, because he did not believe it* : It being shewn, from *Fact*, that the not believing a Doctrine, so useful to Society, was esteemed no Reason why the Legislator should not propagate it. 2. It is a very strong Proof of the Necessity of the Gospel of *Jesus*, that the Sages of *Greece*, with whom all the Wisdom of the World was supposed to be deposited, had philosophised themselves out of one of the most evident and useful Truths with which Mankind is concerned. Nor need we seek any other Justification of the Severity with which the holy Apostles always speak of the Philosophers or Philosophy of *Greece*, than this, the shewing it was directed against these pernicious Principles ; and not, as both *Deists* and *Fanatics* have concurred to represent it, a Condemnation of human Learning in general.

But as now it might be objected that, by this Representation, we lose on the one hand what we gain on the other ; and that while

we shew the *Necessity* of the Gospel, we run a risque of discrediting its *Reasonableness*: For that nothing can seem to bear harder upon *this*, than that the best and wisest Persons of Antiquity did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments: as this, I say, might be objected, we have given a full Answer to it, And, to support our Answer, shewn, that the two Extremes of this Representation, which Divines have been accustomed to go into by contrary Ways, are attended with great and real Mischief to Revelation. While the only View of Antiquity, which yields solid Advantage to the *Christian Cause*, is such a one as this here given; such a one as shews natural Reason to be *clear* enough to *perceive* Truth, and the *Necessity* of its Deductions when proposed; but not generally strong enough to *discover* it, and draw right Deductions from it. And we presume the *Objectors* may allow this to be the *true*, as we have *Cicero* himself for our Warrant, who with an Ingenuity becoming his profound Knowledge of human Nature thus decisively expresses himself:

“ Nam neque tam est acris acies in naturis
 “ hominum et ingeniis, ut res tantas quis-
 “ quam, nisi monstratas, possit videre; neque
 “ tanta tamen in rebus obscuritas, ut eas non
 “ peritus acri vir ingenio cernat, si modo
 “ adspex-

“ adfpexerit^e.” In explaining this Matter, it is occasionally fhewn that of the *ancient* and *modern* Systems of *deiftical* *Morality*, the confeffedly fuperior Perfection in the *latter* is entirely owing to the *unacknowledged* Aid of Revelation.—Thus the Reader fees in what manner we have endeavour’d to prove the MAJOR Propositions of the two Syllogifms, that *whatfoever Religion and Society have no future State for their Support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence*: And that *this was univerfally believed by the Ancients, on their common Principles of Legislation and Wifdom*. For, having fhewn that Religion and Society *were unable, and believed to be unable*, to fupport themfelves under an *ordinary Providence* without a future State; if they *were* fupported without that Doctrine, it *could be, and could be believed to be*, only by an *extraordinary Providence*.

But now, as this Proof is conducted thro’ a long Detail of Circumftances, fhewing the *absolute Neceffity* of Religion in general to Civil Society, and the *Senfe* which all the Wife and Learned of Antiquity had of *that* Neceffity; left this fhould be abufed to countenance the idle and impious Conceit, that Re-

^e De Orat. l. iii. c. xxxi.

ligion was the Invention of Politicians, I concluded the third Book and the Volume together, with proving, that the Notion is both impertinent and false. *Impertinent*, for that, were this Account of Religion right, it would not follow that Religion itself was visionary; but, on the contrary, that it was most real, and supported on the eternal Relations of Things: *False*, for that *Religion*, in fact, existed before the *Civil Magistrate* was in being. But my End in this was not *barely* to remove an Objection against the Truths *here* delivered; but to prepare an opening for those which were to *follow*. For if Religion were so useful to Society, and yet not the Invention of the Magistrate, we must seek its Origin in another Quarter; either from *Nature*, or *Revelation*, or *both*.—Such is the Subject of the *first* Volume of the *Divine Legation*: Which, as I thought proper to publish separately, I contrived should not only contain *Part* of that Proof, but likewise be a *complete* Treatise of itself, establishing one of the most important Truths with which we have to do, viz. *The Necessity of Religion for the Support of Civil Government*. And if, in this View, I have been more than ordinary minute, while treating some Capital Articles in

Support

Support of that Question, I presume I shall not want the Reader's Pardon.

II.

We come now to the SECOND Volume of the *Divine Legation*; which is employed in proving the MINOR Propositions of the two Syllogisms; the first, *That the Jewish Religion and Society had no future State for their Support*; the other, *That Moses skilled in all the ancient Legislation and Wisdom, instituted the Jewish Religion and Society without a future State for its Support*. But in proving the MINOR, a Method something different from that observed in proving the MAJOR Propositions was to be followed. The MAJOR, in the first Volume, were proved *successively*, and in their Order; but in this, the MINOR Propositions are enforced all the Way together: And this, from the Reason of the Thing; the Facts brought to prove the Doctrine omitted, at the same time, *accidentally* shew the Omission designed; and the Facts, brought to prove it designed, *necessarily* shew it omitted. To proceed therefore with the Subject of the *second* Volume.

IV. I just before observed, that the Conclusion of the *first* Volume, which detected the *Absurdity* and *Falsity* of the atheistic Principle, that *Religion was a Creature of the State*, opened the Way to a fair Inquiry whether

ther its original were not as well from *Revelation* as from natural Reason.

In the Introduction therefore, to this Volume, I took the Advantage which that Open afforded me, of shewing that the universal Pretence to Revelation proves *some* Revelation must be true : That this *true* Revelation must have some *characteristic Marks* to distinguish it from the *false* : And that these Marks are to be found in the Institution of *Moses*. But thus far only by Way of *Introduction*, and to lead the Reader more easily into the main Road of our Inquiry ; by shewing him that we pursued no desperate Adventure while we endeavoured to deduce the Divinity of *Moses's* Law from the Circumstances of the Law itself.

I proceeded then to the Proof of the MINOR Propositions, *That the Jewish Religion and Society had no future State for their Support ; and that their Lawgiver purposely omitted it.* To evince these Truths, with sufficient Evidence, the *Nature* of that Institution was to be well understood. But to form a right Idea of *that*, it was expedient we should know the *Manners* and *Genius* of the *Hebrew* People, and the *Character* and *Abilities* of their Lawgiver. Now these having been entirely fashioned on *Egyptian* Models,
it

it was *further* expedient we should know the State of *Egyptian Superstition and Learning* in those early Ages.

In order to this, therefore, I first advanced this Proposition, That *the Egyptian Learning celebrated in Scripture, and the Egyptian Superstition there condemned, were the very Learning and Superstition represented by the Greek Writers, as the Honour and Opprobrium of that Kingdom.* Where, I first state the Question, and shew the equal Extravagancies of both Parties in unreasonably advancing or depressing the high Antiquity of *Egypt*.

I then support my *Proposition*, first by *Fact*, the Testimony of holy Scripture, and of the ancient *Greek Writers* set together, and supporting one another.

Secondly by *Reason*, in an Argument deduced from the Nature, Origin, and various Use, of their so famed *HIEROGLYPHICS*. Where it is shewn, 1. That these were employed as the sole Vehicle of *Egyptian Learning* even *after* the Invention of *Letters*. For which no good Reason can be assigned but this, that they were employed to the same Purpose, *before*. Now *Letters* were in use in the Time of *Moses*. 2. Again, it is further shewn that the *ONIROCRITICS* borrowed their Art of Deciphering from *hieroglyphic Symbols*. But

hieroglyphic Symbols were the mysterious Vehicle of the *Egyptian Learning and Theology*. Now *Onirocritic*, or the Art of Interpreting Dreams, was practised in the Time of *Joseph*. 3. And again, that *hieroglyphic Symbols* were the true Original of ANIMAL WORSHIP in *Egypt*. Now *animal Worship* was established before the Times of *Moses*. From all this it appears that *Egypt* was of that high Antiquity, which Scripture, and the best *Greek Writers* represent it. By which we come to understand what were the specific Manners and Superstitions of *Egypt* in the Time of *Moses*; they being, as now appears, identically the same with what the *Greek Writers* have delivered to us. In the Course of this Proof from *Reason*, in opening at large the Nature, Origin, and various Kinds of *Egyptian Hieroglyphics*, I interweave (as the necessary Explanation of my Subject required) a detailed History of the various *Modes* of ancient *Information* by *Speech* and *Action*. As (on the same Account) in the Original of *Brute-Worship*, I give the History of the various *Modes* of ancient *Idolatry* in the Order they arose out of one another. Now *these* I have not only made to serve in Support of the Question I am *here* upon; but likewise in Support of a *future*, and a *past*.
For

For, in this History of *the various Modes of ancient Information* was laid, as the Reader will find, the Foundation of my Discourse on the *Nature of ancient Prophecies*, in the *sixth* Book ; the Connexion of which Discourse with my *main Subject*, and its high Importance to *Religion in general*, will be explained when we come to that Place : And, in the History of *the various Modes of ancient Idolatry*, he may see my Reasoning in the latter End of the *third* Book, against the Atheistic Origin of Religion, supported and confirmed. So studious have we been to observe what a great Master of Reason lays down as the *Rule and Test* of good Disposition, *that every former Part may give Strength unto all that follow ; and every latter bring Light unto all before.*

But the *high Antiquity* of *Egypt*, tho' proved from *Antiquity* itself, seem'd not enough secured while the Authority of one great *Modern* remained entire and unanswered. In the next Place, therefore, I ventured to examine Sir *I. Newton's Chronology of the Egyptian Empire*, as it is founded in the supposed *Identity* of *Osiris* and *Sesostris* ; which I shew not only contradicts all *profane*, but, what is more, all *sacred Antiquity* ; and, still more, the very *Nature of Things*. In the Course of this Con-

futation, the *Causes* of that endless Confusion in the ancient *Greek History* and *Mythology* are inquired into and explained; which serves, at the same time, to confirm and illustrate all that hath been said, occasionally in the *first* Volume, concerning the Origin and Progress of Idolatry, the Genius of Pagan Religion, their Modes of Worship, and their theological Opinions.

Thus far concerning *the high Antiquity of Egypt*. Which, besides the *immediate* Purpose, of leading us into a true Idea of the *Jewish* Institution, hath these *further* Uses. We have seen, in the foregoing Volume, that *Egypt*, as it was most famed for the Arts of Legislation, so it most of all inculcated the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. Now if *Egypt* were of the high Antiquity I contend for, the Doctrine was inculcated in the Time of the *Hebrew* Captivity: the *Israelites* therefore who lived so long in *Egypt*, and had so thoroughly imbibed the religious Notions of the Place, must needs have been much prejudiced in favour of so reasonable and flattering a Doctrine: and, consequently, their Lawgiver, who had been bred up in all the Learning of *Egypt*, if he had acted only by human Direction, must needs, in Imitation of his Masters, have taken Advantage of this
I favour-

favourable Prejudice to make the Doctrine of a future State the grand *Sanction* of his Religion and Law. Again, the Proof of the high Antiquity of *Egypt* was a necessary Vindication of sacred Scripture ; which all along declares for that Antiquity. But which the *Deist* having endeavoured to take Advantage of against *Moses's* Claim to Inspiration, *Believers* were grown not unwilling to explain away. And while this CHRONOLOGY offered itself to support the Bible *Divinity*, they seemed little attentive to the Liberties it took with the Bible *History*.

To proceed : In order to bring on this Truth of the *high Antiquity* of *Egypt* nearer to my Purpose, I next advanced this *second* Proposition, That *the Jewish People were extremely fond of Egyptian Manners, and did frequently fall into Egyptian Superstitions : And that many of the Laws given to them by the Ministry of Moses were instituted partly in Compliance to their Prejudices, and partly in Opposition to those Superstitions*. Thro' the Proof of the *first* part of the Proposition was proposed to be shewn the high *Probability* of an Institution formed with Reference to *Egyptian Manners*; and thro' the Proof of the *second*, a Demonstration that it was, in *Fact*, so formed. In the

Progress

Progress of this Argument is given an historical Account of the amazing Perversity of the *Jewish* People, from the Time of *Moses's* first Mission, to their Settlement in the Land of *Canaan*. Which serves not only to evince the Fact we are here upon, *their Fondness for Egyptian Manners*; but to prove, (what will stand us in stead hereafter) that a People so obstinate and headstrong, needed, in the Institution of their civil Government and Religion, all possible Curbs to Disorder; of which, for this end, the Doctrine of a *future State* was ever held the chief in ancient Policy.

But now, as it might be objected, that while I am endeavouring to get, this Way, into the *Interior* of the *Jewish* Constitution, I open a Door to the Ravages of Infidelity; it was thought necessary, in order to prevent their taking Advantage of the great Truth contained under the last Proposition, to guard it by the two following,

First, That *Moses's Egyptian Learning, and the Laws instituted in Compliance to the People's Prejudices, and in Opposition to Egyptian Superstitions, are no reasonable Objection to the Divinity of his Mission*. Where, in answering an Objection to the Proof of the *first* Part of this Proposition, I had Occasion to explain the Nature and Origin of the *Schools of the Prophets*

phets: Which, the Reader will find of this *further* Use, to give Strength and Support to what is said, in the *sixth* Book, of the *Nature of Prophecy*; and particularly to what is remarked of *Grotius's* Mistakes in his Manner of interpreting them. And, after having established the Proof of the *second* Part, from the Nature of Things, I examine all the Arguments which have been urged to the contrary, by the learned *Herman Witsius*, in his *Ægyptiaca*, as that Book had been publicly recommended, for a *distinct and solid Confutation* of *Spencer, De Legibus Hebræorum ritualibus*.

But I go further in the *second Proposition*; and prove, that *these very Circumstances* of *Moses's Egyptian Learning, and the Laws instituted in Compliance to the People's Prejudices, and in Opposition to Egyptian Superstitions, are a strong Confirmation of the Divinity of his Mission*: For, that one bred up in the Arts of *Egyptian Legislation*, could never, on his own Head, have thought of reducing an unruly People to Government on Maxims of Religion and Policy fundamentally opposite to all the Principles of *Egyptian Wisdom*. And yet *Moses* did this, in *enjoining the Worship of the true God only*; and, in *omitting the Doctrine of a future State*. And again, that One who *falsely* pretended to Inspiration, and
to

to receive the whole Frame of a national Constitution from God himself, would never have risked his Pretences by a ritual Law, which the People could see was politically instituted, partly in Compliance to their Prejudices, and partly in Opposition to *Egyptian* Superstitions. And with this the *fourth* Book concludes.

V. What hath been hitherto said was to let us, in *general* only, into the Genius of the *Jewish* Policy; in order to our judging more exactly of the *peculiar Nature* of its Government; that from thence, we might be enabled to determine, with full Certainty, on the Matters in Question, as they are contained in the two MINOR Propositions.

The *fifth* Book, therefore, comes *still nearer* to the Point, and considers this *peculiar Nature* of the *Jewish* Government. Which is shewn to have been a THEOCRACY, properly so called, where God himself became the supreme civil Magistrate. This Form of Government is shewn to have been *necessary* for the Times. In proving which, the Law of *punishing for Opinions*, under a *Theocracy*, is occasionally explained. And as the *Deists* have been accustomed to object this Punishment against the divine Original of the Law, it is justified at large, on the Principles of natural
tural

tural Equity: Which serves, at the same time, both to confirm the *Reality* of a *Theocracy*, and also to give new Strength and Support to what had been said on the Subject of *Toleration*, in the *first* Volume.

2. This Theocracy, which was *necessary*, was (as I then shew from the Notions and Opinions of those Times concerning *Tutulary Deities*) of the most *easy Introduction* likewise. But here, speaking of the Method of Providence in employing the *Prejudices* of Men to the great Ends of its Dispensations, I observe, that when ever divine Wisdom thought fit so to do, it was always accustomed to insert some characteristic Note of Difference, to mark the Institution, it established, for its own: which leading me to enumerate some of those *Notes*, I insisted chiefly upon this, “ that the *Mosaic Religion* “ was *built upon a former*, namely, the *Pa-* “ *triarchal*: Whereas the various Religions “ of the *Pagan World* were all *unrelated to*, “ and *independent of one another*.” As this was a Circumstance necessary to be well understood for a perfect Comprehension of the *Jewish Establishment* (the Subject in hand) I took the Advantage which the celebrated Author of *the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* had afforded me, (who, to discredit *Revelation*, has thought fit to affirm

O

the

the direct contrary) of supporting it against him in an Examination of his *Facts* and *Reasonings* on this Head.

3. I proceed, in the next Place, to shew, that those Prejudices which made the *Introduction* of a *Theocracy* so easy, occasioned as easy a *Defection* from the Laws of it. In which I had Occasion to explain the Nature of the *Worship of tutelary Gods*, and of that *Idolatry* wherewith the *Jewish* People were so obstinately besotted. Both which Discourses serve these further Purposes, the *former*, to support and explain what had been said, in the *first* Volume, concerning the Genius of Pagan *Intercommunity* of Worship: And the *latter* (besides a particular Use to be made of it in the *third* Volume) to obviate a common Objection of Unbelievers; who, from this Circumstance of the continual Defection of the *Jews* into Idolatry, would infer, that God's Dispensation to them could never have been so illustrious as their History represents it: These Men supposing that this Idolatry consisted in *renouncing* the Law of *Moses*; and renouncing it as *dissatisfied of its Truth*: Both which Suppositions are here shewn to be false.

Having explained the *Nature* of the *Theocracy*, and the *attendant Circumstances* of its *Erection*; we then inquire concerning its *Duration*

ration. A *Theocracy*, therefore, in strict Truth and Propriety, we shew, continued throughout the whole Period of the *Jewish* State, even to the Coming of *Christ*. The Use to be made hereafter of this Truth, is to inforce the *Connexion* between the two Religions; a Circumstance, tho' much neglected, incumbent on every rational Defender of *Revelation* to support.

We come next to the *peculiar Consequences attending the Administration of a Theocracy*: Which bring us yet nearer to our Point. Here, it is shewn that one *necessary Consequence*, was an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. And agreeably to this, (as deduced from the *Nature of Things*) that holy Scripture does *in Fact* exhibit to us this very Representation of God's Government: And further, that there are many favourable Circumstances, in the *Character* of the *Jewish* People, to induce a candid Examiner to conclude this Representation true. Tho' here the Reader should observe, that my Argument does not require me to prove more, in this place, than that an *extraordinary Providence* is represented in Scripture, to be administered: The Proof of its real Administration it is the Purpose of this Work to give thro' the great MEDIUM of my Theses, the *Omission of the Doctrine of a fu-*

ture State of Rewards and Punishments. If therefore I clearly shew, from the whole *Jewish History*, that the Matter is thus *represented*, the Inference from my *Medium*, which proves the Representation *true*, answers all Objections, both as to our inadequate Conception of the Manner how such a Providence could be administered; and as to certain Passages in holy Scripture that seem to clash with this its general *Representation*. And yet both these Objections (to leave no Shadow of Doubt unsatisfied) are considered likewise: But as important as this Fact, of an *extraordinary Providence represented*, is, even to our present Purpose, it has a still further Use when employed amongst those distinguishing *Marks* of the Truth of *Moses's* divine Mission in *general*. For, from hence, we may observe, the unnecessary Trouble and Hazard to which he exposed himself, had that Mission been only pretended. Had he, like the rest of the ancient Lawgivers, done no more than barely affected *Inspiration*, he had then no occasion to propagate the Belief of a *constant equal Providence*; a Dispensation, if only feigned, so easy to be confuted. But, by deviating from their general Practice, and persuading the People, that the *inspiring tutelary God* would become their *King*, he laid himself under a Necessity of teaching an *extraordi-*

traordinary Providence; and perpetually insisting on it as the great Sanction of his Laws; a dead Weight, if he were an Impostor, that nothing but downright Folly could have brought him to undergo.

To proceed, after having laid this strong and necessary Foundation, we come at length DIRECTLY to our Point. If the *Jewish* Government were a *Theocracy*, it was administered by an *extraordinary Providence*; the Consequence of which is, that *temporal Rewards and Punishments* (the Effects of this Providence) and not *Future*, were the SANCTION of their Law and Religion. Thus far therefore hath the *very Nature* of the *Jewish* Government brought us. And this methinks is bringing us fairly up to the Proof of our two MINOR Propositions. So necessary, as the Reader now sees, was this *long Discourse of the Nature of the Jewish Government*. But, to prevent all Cavil, I go further; and shew, that the Doctrine of a *future State* of Rewards and Punishments, which could not, from the Nature of Things, be the *Sanction* of the Law, *was not*, in fact, *taught in it at all*; but purposely omitted by their great Prophet. This is proved from several Circumstances in the Books of *Genesis* and the *Law*. Where, to shew, that *Moses*, who, it is seen, *studiously* omitted it, was well *apprised* of its Importance, I prove that
the

the *Punishment of Children for the Crimes of their Parents* was brought into this Institution purposely to supply some Advantages to Government, which the Doctrine of a *future State* affords. This, at the same time that it further supports the Opinion of *no future State* in the *Mosaic Dispensation*, gives me a fair Occasion of vindicating the Justice and Equity of the *Law, of punishing Children for the Crimes of their Parents*; and proving the perfect Agreement between *Moses* and the *Prophets* concerning it: Which had been, in all Ages, the Stumbling block of Infidelity.

But we go yet further, and shew, that, as *Moses* forebore to teach the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, so neither had the ancient *Jews*, that is to say, the *Body* of the People, any Knowledge of it. The Proof is striking, and scarce to be resisted by any Party or Profession but the *System-maker's*. The Bible contains a very circumstantial History of this People from the Time of *Moses* to the great Captivity. Not only of public Occurrences, but the private Adventures of Persons of both Sexes, and of all Ages and Stations, of all Characters and Complexions; in the Lives of Virgins, Matrons, Kings, Soldiers, Scholars, Priests, Merchants, Husbandmen. They are given too in every Circum-

Circumstance of Life; victorious, captive, sick, and in Health; in full Security and amidst impending Dangers; plunged in civil Business, or retired and sequestered in the Service of Religion. Together with their Story, we have their *Compositions* likewise. Here they sing their Triumphs; there their Palinodia: Here they offer up their Hymns of Praise and Petitions to the Deity; here they urge their moral Precepts to their Countrymen; and here again they treasure up their Prophecies and Predictions for Posterity: Yet in none of these different Circumstances of Life, in none of these various Casts of Composition, do we ever find them acting on the Motives, or influenced by the Prospect of a *future State*; or indeed expressing the least *Hopes* or *Fears*, or even common *Curiosity* concerning it: But every thing they do or say respects the present Life only; the Good and Ill of which are the sole Objects of all their Pursuits and Aversions*.

* It is very remarkable that nothing so strongly evinces the desperate Folly of those who imagine the Bible has been adulterated by the *Jews* (unless it be their own Scheme of reforming it, by the Assistance of a *Jew*, who has accommodated it to the Taste of *Paganism*) than this very Circumstance of the profound Silence throughout, concerning a *future State*. For had the *Rabbins* ever tamper'd with it on any Head, it had certainly been on this, which they hold to be

And

And here I will appeal to my Adversaries themselves. Let them speak, and tell me, if they were now first shewn some History of an old *Greek Republic*, delivered in the Form and Manner of the *Jewish*, and no more Notice in it of a future State, whether they could possibly believe that that Doctrine was national, or generally known in it. If they have the least Ingenuity, they will answer, *they could not*. On what then do they support their Belief here but on *religious Prejudices*? Prejudices of no higher an Original neither than some *Dutch or German System*: For, as to the *Bible*, one half of it is silent concerning *Life and Immortality*; and the other half declares the Doctrines were *brought to light thro' the Gospel*; which too is a Circumstance in Support of our Conclusion from the *Jewish History*, that would be wanting in the Case given of a *Grecian*.

The Strength of this Argument is still further supported by a View of the general History of Mankind: And particularly of those Nations most resembling the *Jewish* by their Genius and Circumstances: In which we find the

the very *Fundamental of Fundamentals*^b. And which yet, after all their Sweat and Labour, to discover in the Bible, they could never get to; but are forced at last to take it upon Trust or Tradition, as the *Indians* do their *fundamental Tortoise*.

^b Maimon.

Doctrine of a future State was always pushing on its Influence. It was their constant *Viaticum* through Life; it stimulated them to War, and spirited their Songs of Triumph; it made them insensible of Pain, immoveable in Danger, and superior to the Hour of Death. But this is not all, we observe that even in the *Jewish Annals*, when this Doctrine was become national, it made as considerable a Figure in their History, as in that of any other People. In the last Place we shew, that it is not on the *negative Silence only* of the sacred Writers, or of the Speakers they introduce, that we support our Conclusion; but from their *positive Declarations*, by which they plainly discover, that there was no popular Expectation of a future State or Resurrection. Such as these; *That he that goeth down to the Grave shall come up no more*^a.—*That in Death there is no Remembrance of God, and in the Grave no one shall give him Thanks*^b.—*That the Dead know not any thing, neither have any more a Reward*^c.—*That they who go down to the Pit cannot hope for God's Truth*^d.—*That those who are dead, are not*^e. Where we find it to be the same popular Language through-

^a 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

^b Is. xxxviii. 18, 19.

^c Ps. vi. 5.

^d Eccles. ix. 5.

^e Jer. v. 7.

out, and in every Circumstance of Life ; as well in the *cool Philosophy* of the Author of *Ecclesiastes*, as amidst the *Distresses* of the *Psalmist*, the *Lamentations* of the Prophet, and the *Exultations* of good *Hezekiah*. But is it possible this could be the Language of a People instructed in the Doctrine of *Life and Immortality*? Or do we find one word of it, on any Occasion whatsoever, in the Writers of the *New Testament*, but where 'tis brought in to be confuted and condemned? The People in *Jeremiah* say, that *those who are dead, are not*: *Jesus*, in the Gospel, that *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are amongst the Living*. Good Men amongst the *Jews* said, *that those who go down to the Grave come up no more, know not any thing, have no Reward*, and therefore prayed for long Life here, to praise the God of their Salvation: *St. Paul*, on the contrary, devoutly wished for his Dissolution, in order to receive elsewhere the Reward of his Faith and spiritual Warfare. Here, therefore, let me admonish certain *Dealers in Systems*, for once to suspend their *Trade*, and attend a Moment to the Arguments they write against. For it will not be thought enough that they prove, on the Principles of their Systems, that *the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments OUGHT to be in the Religion of Moses*,

Moses, and therefore is there. The Public will now expect, that they directly apply themselves to the Refutation of *these* Arguments; which, being founded on *no System*, proceed in a different manner; and, from the *Proof* of what *is not* there, *conclude*, what *ought not* to be there.—But it is much easier to tell us *what should be* in a Book, than to account for *what is* in it.

From the *Old Testament*, we proceed to the *New*; by which it appears, from the inspired Writers of *this* likewise, that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments did NOT make Part of the *Mosaic Dispensation*. Their Evidence we have divided into two Parts, the *first* proving that *temporal* Rewards and Punishments were the *Sanction* of the *Jewish Dispensation*; the *second*, that it had *no other*. And thus, with the directest and most unexceptionable Proof of the two MINOR Propositions, the *fifth* Book concludes.

VI. But to remove, as far as I was able, all Grounds of *Prejudice* to this momentous Truth, I employed the *sixth* and last Book of this Volume in examining those Texts of the *Old* and *New Testament*, which had been commonly urged to prove that the Doctrine of

a future State of Rewards and Punishments *did* make part of the *Mosaic Dispensation*.

Amongst those of the *Old Testament*, the famous Passage in the *xixth* Chapter of the Book of *Job* holding the principal Place, I judged it of Importance, for the Reasons there assigned to examine this Matter to the Bottom ; which necessarily engaged me in an Enquiry into the *Nature* and *Genius* of that Book ; *when* written, and to *what Purpose* ; whereby not only a fair Account is given of the Sense of that Passage, consistent with my Proposition ; but a strong Support is provided for what will be further said in the *third* and last Volume, concerning the *gradual Decay* of the extraordinary Providence, from the Time of *Saul* to the Return from the great Captivity, and Resettlement in the Land of *Judea*.

But this Dissertation has still a further, and very important use, regarding *Revelation in general*. For shewing therein, how the Principles of the Gospel Doctrine *opened by degrees*, fully obviates the Calumnies of *Tyndal* and *Collins* : who pretend that the Priests and Leaders of the *Jews* refined their old Doctrines concerning the Deity, and invented new ones, just as they advanced in Knowledge or the People in Curiosity ; or as both were bet-
ter

ter instructed in the Country to which they were led captive.

In examining the Texts of the *New Testament*, the famous *eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews* was not forgotten; the Sense of which is cleared up from the strongest and most inveterate Mistakes of systematical Divines. In this Place is occasionally explained and illustrated a Matter of the highest Moment for the understanding St. Paul's Epistles, namely, *the Nature of the Apostolic Reasoning, against the Errors of the Jewish Converts*; and this likewise contributes still further to support the Truth of our two MINOR Propositions.

As in all this I taught nothing contrary to the Doctrine of our excellent Church, my Profession, in common *Decency*, not to say *Justice* both to myself and others, required I should vindicate the Reality of my Conformity. Having therefore declared it as my unfeigned Opinion that, “ tho’ a future State
“ of Rewards and Punishments made no part
“ of the *Mosaic Dispensation*, yet that the
“ Law had a *spiritual* Meaning, to be understood when the Fullness of Time should
“ come, and hence received the *Nature*, and
“ afforded the *Efficacy* of *Prophecy*: And
“ That in the *interim*, the *Mystery of the*
“ *Gospel*

“ Gospel was occasionally revealed by God to
 “ his chosen Servants, the *Leaders* and *Fa-*
 “ *thers* of the *Jewish* Nation ; and the *Dawn-*
 “ *ing* of it gradually opened by the Prophets
 “ to the People :” Having, I say, declared
 this to be my unfeigned Opinion, I shew,
 from the Words of the *Seventh Article of*
Religion, that it is the Opinion of our excel-
 lent Church likewise. And that I may not
 be suspected of Tergiversation, when I sub-
 scribe to this *Article*, that *They are not to be*
heard which feign, that the old Fathers did look
only for transitory Promises, I attempt to illu-
 strate the Words of *Jesus*, where he says that
Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's Day, and saw
it and was glad, by the noblest Instance that
 ever was given of the *Harmony* between the
Old and New Testament, on the Principles
 before laid down in the Discourse on the
Hieroglyphics ; and shew that the Command to
Abraham to offer *Isaac* was merely an Informati-
 on (given at *Abraham's* earnest Request) in a
representative Action, instead of *Words*, of the
 Redemption of Mankind by the great Sacrifice
 of *Christ*. From whence we gain two other
 Advantages, besides that more *immediate*, of
 justifying the Doctrine of our *national Church*.
 The *first* of which is the supporting a real
 and essential *Connection* between *Judaism* and
 Christi-

Christianity. The *other* is, disposing the Deists to think more favourably of their Bible: For our Interpretation overthrows all Objections to this part of *Abraham's* History. The Matter therefore being of this high Importance, it was proper to fix it on such Principles as would leave no Room for Doubt or Objection. And this could be done only by explaining the Nature of those various *Modes of Information* in use amongst the Ancients; for which Explanation likewise a proper Foundation had been laid in the Discourse on the *Hieroglyphics*. But this is not all, we get a yet further and much more considerable Benefit by it, and that is the clearing up and vindicating the logical Truth and Propriety of *Types in Action*, and *secondary Senses in Speech*: whereon the Divinity of the ancient *Prophecies concerning Christ* are to be supported; and which, at this Time, most needed a Support. For tho' the greater part of these *Prophecies* relate to *Jesus* only in a *secondary* Sense, yet had some Men of Name and in the Interests of Religion, thro' Ignorance of the true Original and Nature of *secondary Senses*, rashly concurred with modern *Judaism* and *Infidelity*, to give up all such as *illogical* and *enthusiastic*, to the imminent Hazard of overturning the very Foundation of our Faith. In the Course of
this

this Enquiry, I had an Opportunity of examining and confuting one of the most able and plausible Books ever written against Revelation, *the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, which goes entirely upon the illogical Fanaticism of a *secondary Sense of Prophecies*.

The intelligent Reader will, I presume, allow these Reasons sufficient to justify the Length of this *Dissertation*: but there were two other more *immediately* relative to my Question, that engaged me in the Enquiry. The *one* was to shew, that those, who contend for the *Christian* Doctrine of a *future State's* being revealed to the early *Jews*, destroy all *Reason* of a *secondary Sense* of Prophecies; (a Matter, as we have shewn, of the utmost Importance to Revelation:) For how can it be *certainly* known, from the Prophecies themselves, that they contain *double Senses*, but from hence, that the *old Law* was preparatory to, and the Rudiments of, the *New*? How shall *this Relation* be *certainly* known, but from hence, *that no future State of Rewards and Punishments is to be found in the Mosaic Dispensation*? So close a Dependence have all these momentous Principles on one another. The *other* more *immediate* Reason for this *Dissertation*, on *Types and secondary Senses*, was this: As I had shewn that a future

State

Occasional Reflections. 113

State of Rewards and Punishments was revealed under no part of the *Jewish* Oeconomy any otherwise than by *those* Modes of Information, it was necessary, in order to shew the *real* Connection between *Judaism* and *Christianity*, (the Truth of the latter Religion depending on that *real* Connection) to prove *those* Modes logical and rational. For as on the one hand, had the Doctrine of Life and Immortality been *revealed* under the *Mosaic* Oeconomy, *Judaism* had been *more* than a *Rudiment* and *Preparation* of *Christianity*; so had no *covert* Intimations at all been given of the Doctrine, it had been *less*: That is, the Dependency and Connection between the two Religions had not been sufficiently marked out and ascertained. With this *necessary* Dissertation, therefore, this *sixth* and last Book of the *second* Volume concludes.

Thus the Reader sees at length, how *regularly* and *intently* these two Volumes have been carried on: The *first* in proving the MAJOR; and the *second*, the MINOR Propositions of the two *Syllogisms*. In which, tho' the Author (whose Passion is not so much a fondness for his own Argument as for the Honour and Support of Religion itself) has neglected no fair Occasion of enforcing every Circumstance, that might serve to illustrate the

Q

Truth

114 *Remarks on several*

Truth of *Revelation in general*; yet he never loses Sight of his End; but, as the Rule for conducting the most regular Works prescribes,

Semper ad eventum festinat.

This Volume too I thought fit to publish alone, as I did the First; tho' not merely for the same Reason, its being a perfect and entire Whole of itself, explaining the Nature and Genius of the Jewish Constitution; but for a much better,—that it fairly finished the Argument. For my Logic teaches me, that, when the MAJOR and the MINOR are once proved, the CONCLUSION follows of course. And this is, that THE JEWISH RELIGION AND SOCIETY WERE SUPPORTED BY AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE: For be this never so furious a PARADOX, it may be rendered as tame and harmless as any other Truth by the common Advantages of Argument; unless a Raifer of Paradoxes, like a Raifer of Rebellion, is to be ipso facto, outlawed; and the One denied all Benefit of the Logic, as the Other is, of the Law, of his Country.

III.

VII. It may be asked then, what I mean by a *third* Volume, if the Argument be ended

in

in the *second*? To this I answer, That it is one Thing to satisfy Truth; and another, her pretended Followers. He who engages for *Revelation*, has *many* Prejudices to encounter; but he who engages for it, under *Reason* only, has *many more*. I cannot then make too sure of my Reader. And, luckily, the *Plan* of my Work obliging me to continue the *History of the Religious Doctrines of the Jews*, from the Time of the first *Prophets*, to that of the *Maccabees*, when the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments first became *national*; this History will afford abundant Proofs for the further Illustration of the MAJOR Propositions of the two Syllogisms. And this will make the Subject of the *seventh* Book of the *Divine Legation*, or the *first* part of the *Third* Volume.

VIII. Having in this Manner gone through my *general Argument*, what remains is an Examination of the principal *Objections* that may be urged against it: And these being founded in the supposed Views and Objects of the *Jewish* Lawgiver, this Examination will be chiefly employed in explaining and vindicating the true CHARACTER of MOSES: From whence will arise a new Series of Arguments for the Support of the MINOR Propo-

sitions of the two *Syllogisms* : and, particularly, a Demonstration that shews the *Conclusion* of the *second Syllogism* *, to have all the Force of the *first* * : the only thing it might seem to want. This Demonstration may be reduced to this Syllogism.

None, but one ignorant of the World, or an Enthusiast, who had received a Promise like that given to the *Jews*, and had lived to the Time marked for its Accomplishment, could be mistaken either about the Promise or its Completion.

But *Moses* received such a Promise, and lived to the Time marked for its Accomplishment, and was neither ignorant of the World, nor an Enthusiast.

Therefore *Moses* not mistaken either about the Promise or its Accomplishment.

This will make the Subject of the *eighth* Book, or the *second* part of the *third* Volume.

IX. But having, towards the Conclusion of the *eighth* Book, in answer to various infidel *Objections*, examined the *pretended Reasons* of the *Omission* of the Doctrine of a future State

* Namely, that *Moses*, who taught, believed likewise, that the Jewish Religion and Society were to be supported by an extraordinary Providence.

* Namely, that they were under an extraordinary Providence.

of Rewards and Punishments in the *Mosaic* Dispensation; I am naturally and necessarily led to enquire, further, into the TRUE. For now it might be *finally objected*, that though, under an *extraordinary Providence*, there might be *no Occasion* for the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, in Support of Religion, or the Ends of Government; yet, as that Doctrine was *true*, and, consequently, under every Regiment of Providence, *useful*; it seems hard to conceive that the Religious Leader of the *Jews*, because, as a Lawgiver, he could do without it; that therefore, as a Divine, he would omit it. The Objection is of Weight in itself, and receives much additional Strength from what we have observed in the *fifth* Book concerning the *Reason* of the Law of *punishing Children for the Crimes of their Parents*. I hold it therefore not sufficient barely to reply, *Moses omitted it, that his Law might thereby remain throughout all Ages an invincible Monument of the Truth of his Pretences*; but proceed to explain the *great and principal Reason* of the Omission. And now, *ventum ad VERUM est*. This leads me into one general View of the whole Course of God's universal Oeconomy from *Adam* to *Christ*, ending in a Dissertation on the true Nature and Genius of the CHRISTIAN FAITH,

FAITH, and so adding new and irresistible Force to the CONCLUSIONS of both my *Syllogisms*. With this the *ninth* Book, or *third* part of the last Volume concludes.

This I purpose to give the Public without Delay: Not for any pressing Necessity my *Argument* has of it, for I left it not, as was insinuated, naked and supportless; but, as the Reader now sees, surrounded with various *Out-works*, and standing strongly on its *Conclusion*; But, principally, that I may be at Liberty to address myself to a much larger Work. *A full Defence of Revelation in general and of the Christian Faith in particular, against Unbelievers of all Denominations*. A Work long projected, and which my Christian Profession, and still more solemn Engagements in the Service of Religion, persuaded me was my Duty, with the good Leave of my Brethren, to devote myself unto.—Not to speak at present of the high Encouragement to all Attempts of this Nature from the Felicity of the Times, which is, or would be, always urging me on, in the Words of the Poet:

“ ——— Va pâler sur la Bible;
 “ Va marquer les écueils de cette mer terrible:
 “ Perce la sainte horreur de ce Livre divin:
 “ Confons dans un Ouvrage & Tindal &
 Collin:

Occasional Reflections. 119

“ Débrouille des vieux tems les querelles célèbres :

“ Eclairci des Rabins les savantes ténèbres :

“ Afin qu'en ta vieillesse, un livre en maroquin

“ Aille offrir ton travail à quelque heureux Faquin,

“ Qui, pour digne loier de la Bible éclaircie,

“ Te paie en l' acceptant d'un JE VOUS RE-
MERCIE.

Boileau.



APPEN-

APPENDIX.

Containing the Judgments of GROTIUS, EPISCOPIUS, and Bishop BULL, shewing that a future State of Rewards and Punishments was not taught to the People of the Jews by the Law and Religion of Moses.

GROTIUS.

“ **M**oses in Religionis Judaicæ Institutione,
“ si diserta Legis respicimus, nihil promisit supra hujus vitæ bona, terram uberem,
“ penum copiosum, victoriam de hostibus, longam & valentem senectutem, posteros cum
“ bona spe superstites. Nam, SI QUID EST
“ ULTRA, in umbris obtegitur, aut sapienti ac
“ DIFFICILI ratiocinatione colligendum est.”

EPISCOPIUS.

“ In tota Lege Mosaica nullum vitæ æternæ
“ præmium, ac ne æterni quidem præmii INDICIUM VEL VESTIGIUM extat: quicquid nunc
“ Judæi multum de futuro seculo, de resurrectione
“ ctione

“ ctione mortuorum, de vita æterna loquantur,
 “ & ex Legis verbis ea extorquere potius quam
 “ ostendere conentur, NE LEGEM MOSIS IM-
 “ PERFECTAM ESSE cogantur agnoscere cum
 “ Sadducæis; quos olim (& uti observo ex scrip-
 “ tis Rabbinorum, hodieque) vitam futuri sæculi
 “ Lege Mosis nec promitti nec contineri adfir-
 “ maffe, quum tamen Judæi essent, certissimum
 “ est. Nempe non nisi per Cabalam sive Tradi-
 “ tionem, quam illi in universum rejiciebant,
 “ opinionem sive fidem illam irrepsisse asseriebant.
 “ Et sane opinionum, quæ inter Judæos erat,
 “ circa vitam futuri sæculi discrepantia, arguit
 “ promissiones Lege factas tales esse ut ex iis
 “ certi quid de vita futuri sæculi non possit col-
 “ ligi. Quod & Servator noster non obscure in-
 “ nuit, cum resurrectionem mortuorum colligit
 “ Mat. xxii. non ex promisso aliquo Legi ad-
 “ dito, sed ex generali tantum illo promisso Dei,
 “ quo se Deum Abrahami, Isaaci, & Jacobi fu-
 “ turum spoponderat: quæ tamen illa collectio
 “ magis nititur cognitione intentionis divinæ sub
 “ generalibus istis verbis occultatæ aut compre-
 “ hensæ, de qua Christo certo constabat, quàm
 “ necessaria consequentia sive verborum vi ac
 “ virtute manifestâ, qualis nunc & in verbis
 “ Novi Testamenti, ubi vita æterna & resurrectio
 “ mortuorum proram & puppim faciunt totius
 “ Religionis Christianæ, & tam clarè ac disertè
 “ promittuntur ut ne hiscere quidem contra quis
 “ possit.” *Instit. Theol.* lib. iii. sect. i. c. 2.

B U L L.

“ Primo quæritur an in Vet. Testamento nullum
 “ omnino extet vitæ æternæ promissum ? de eo
 “ enim a nonnullis dubitatur. Resp. Huic quæ-
 “ stioni optimè mihi videtur respondere Augusti-
 “ nus, distinguens nomen Veteris Testamenti :
 “ nam eo intelligi ait aut pactum illud, quod in
 “ monte Sinai factum est, aut omnia, quæ in
 “ Mose, Hagiographis, ac Prophetis continentur.
 “ Si vetus Testamentum posteriori sensu accipia-
 “ tur, concedi FORSITAN possit, esse in eo non-
 “ nulla futuræ vitæ non obscura indicia ; præ-
 “ fertim in libro Psalmodum, Daniele, & Eze-
 “ kiele : quanquam vel in his Libris clarum ac
 “ disertum æternæ vitæ promissum VIX AC NE
 “ vix quidem reperias. Sed hæc qualiacunque
 “ erant, non erant nisi præludia & anticipationes
 “ gratiæ Evangelicæ, AD LEGEM NON PERTI-
 “ NEBANT.— Lex enim promissa habuit terrena,
 “ & terrena TANTUM. — Si quis contra sentiat,
 “ ejus est locum dare, ubi æternæ vitæ promif-
 “ sio extat ; QUOD CERTE IMPOSSIBILE EST.—
 “ Sub his autem verbis [legis ipsius] Dei inten-
 “ tione comprehensam fuisse vitam æternam, ex
 “ interpretatione ipsius Christi ejusque Aposto-
 “ lorum manifestum est. Verùm hæc non suffi-
 “ ciunt ut dicamus vitam æternam in Foedere
 “ Mosaico promissam fuisse. Nam primo pro-
 “ missa, præsertim Foederi annexa, debent esse
 “ clara ac diserta, & ejusmodi, ut ab utraque
 “ parte stipulante intelligi possint. Promissa au-
 “ tem hæc typica & generalia, non addita ali-
 “ unde interpretatione, PENE IMPOSSIBILE ERAT
 “ UT

APPENDIX. 123

“UT QUIS ISTO SENSU INTELLIGERET.” *Harmonia Apostolica, Dissert. poster. c. x. sect. viii. p. 474. inter Op. Om. Ed. 1721.*

1. Thus these three great Ornaments of the Protestant Religion. And what more has been said or done by the Author of the *Divine Legation*? Only this, he hath shewn, that the Absence or Omission of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in the *Mosaic* Religion is a certain Mark of its Divinity. *Forgive me this Wrong.* It has indeed been objected that bishop *Bull* talked very differently in an *English* posthumous Sermon. All that I can say to this is, that, if he did so, it was not by my Direction; who hold it to be unlawful to say one thing to the People and another to their Pastors. But bishop *Bull*, it seems, might say what he pleased. He might, to support his Opinion, say without Censure, nay, with Commendation, *that the Doctrine of a future State was amongst the Arcana of the Jews: That there was a twofold manner of teaching amongst them, one suited to vulgar Apprehensions, the other to those who had made some Proficiency in Knowledge*^a. But if I venture to say so, a Legion of Bigots are in arms. And do I say any other, in affirming, that *during the early Ages of the Jewish Republick a future State was not a national Doctrine, but known only to some few of their Leaders*? Thus can the Writer quoted above abuse me, throughout a whole Pamphlet, for holding the very same thing for which bishop *Bull* merited his Com-

^a *An Examination of Mr. Warburton's second Proposition, &c. in an epistolary Dissertation addressed to the Author, p. 125. just now come to my Hands.*

mendation; and this in an outrageous Manner too, as if I had said something most derogatory to the Honour and Attributes of God. But this is the *Hocus pocus* of Controversy. When the Bishop and I have paid him in the same Coin, that, from the Bishop's Pocket, shall be true orthodox Sterling; which, from mine, comes out clipt, washt, and counterfeit. But the Man's a Bungler; and neither understands clean Conveyance, nor has Assurance enough to outface the Fraud. For conscious, as it were, of an ill-plaid Trick, he patches up the Cheat in this slovenly Manner, *Surely, (says he) there is a great Difference between industriously keeping a thing out of Sight, and industriously propagating it amongst all WHO WERE ABLE AND WILLING TO RECEIVE IT* ^b. Illustrious Distinguisher! Does not the BISHOP'S *industriously propagating it amongst all who are able and willing to receive it*, imply the *keeping it out of Sight* from the rest? And does not MY *industriously keeping it out of sight* from the rest, imply the *propagating it amongst all who were able and willing to receive it*? But, in this Case, I have done more than by Implication; I have said over and over again, that it was communicated to the few *able* to receive it. I did not indeed add *willing*. That Discovery was reserved for the wonderful Penetration of our Author. I had no Conception but that every Jew was *willing* enough to receive *not only the Promise of the Life that now is, but of that which is to come*: But it is a reasonable Question whether they were as *able*; and would not then have quitted both the School and School-master that was to bring them to Christ

^b Page 129.

long before the good Time he had appointed. But these are Matters above our Author's Comprehension. He will needs know why God acted thus mysteriously. I will tell him when he informs me (and perhaps before) why *America* for so many Ages was debarred the Light of the Gospel. Were not these his Offspring as well as the Sons of *Abraham*? But this is the Advantage that he and his Fellows take with the Ignorant. They cry out, What! a Religion from God without a future State? No. Rather than this, any thing. They will go a Text-hunting, lie at catch for an Ambiguity, divorce the Sentence from its Context, strip it naked; and if, after all this Violence, it does but squint their way, see here, say they, as clear a Proof of it as from the preaching of *Jesus*. Yet let these Texts but speak for themselves, or without any other Prompter than the Context, and we shall soon see that there is not one of all they have ever produced, in the Period in question, that can by any Rules of good Critic be made to signify the least Notice of a future State, otherwise than in a secondary and spiritual Sense. In the mean time let no good Man be scandalized with their Clamour. All such shall soon see this Tempest of Malice and Bigottry dispersed, and the Scripture of God at last vindicated even from its worst and most fatal Mischief; the Virulence of false Zeal. But this and Bigottry have so blinded our Anonymous, that in another place he insultingly asks me^b, *WHERE I learnt that Death doth not now reign?* and yet before he ends his Page he himself

^b Page 70.

126 A P P E N D I X.

quotes these Words of the Apostle, *Jesus Christ hath abolished Death*^c.

2. But now, if the bringing over such kind of Writers, and leading them into the *Dawn of Sense*, were any Matter of Merit, I had much to boast of. When I first adventured to fall upon their Systems, nothing was heard amongst them but “that *Moses did teach* a future State: and “plainly too, if not, the worse for him; for he “*ought to have taught it.*” This was then the Cry. But now their Note is altered. This Anonymous owns very frankly that *Moses taught no future State*, nay more, *could not teach it*. *Moses* (says he) *as an authorized Teacher could not declare the Doctrine of a future State*^d. *This Doctrine was not in his Commission*^e. And so, in other Places, to the same Purpose. Thus, after having fought through all *their own* Weapons in vain, they will now try if they cannot silence me with *mine*; and make that very Principle on which I raised my *second Proposition* serve to the Subversion of it. For the Reader must not fancy that they now begin to embrace any of my Principles in the Love of Truth, but of Contention only. But let us take him as we find him. He says, *Moses had it not in Commission to teach a future State*. Be it so. I ask then, first, how he comes to *know* this? If he says, because *Moses did not teach it*, he will argue as becomes him. But I will suppose him to say, *because it was reserved for the Commission of Jesus*. Then thus I argue—That *traditional Knowledge*, which this Man says they had of the Doctrine, was either a *divine* or *human Tradition*. If he says, a *divine*,

^c 2 Tim. i. 10.

^d Page 5.

^e Page 7.

A P P E N D I X. 127

then some holy Man had it in *Commission* to teach before *Moses*, or God himself taught it. In either Case, I ask why it could not have been intrusted to *Moses*, when instituting a new Religion and civil Government, since it was of a *Nature to be intrusted*? If he will say, of *human Tradition*, it is then certain *Moses's* Silence, in a Religion to which nothing was to be added, and from which nothing was to be taken, must have very soon erased all human Traditions from the Minds and Memory of the People; which indeed was the Case. Tho' human Traditions, in After Ages, they had enough. And when I come to shew why they took them up, and whence they had them, that they had them not in the Times in question will be seen to a Demonstration. I only mention this to shew, the wretched Futility of such a Writer, who, when he steals a true Principle, knows so little what to make of it. It is very true, *This Doctrine was not in Moses's Commission*. And from this great Truth I shall prove to the Shame of all such Writers that it *could not* be a national Doctrine amongst the *Jews* in the Times I mention. But this in my last Volume. For I proceed very differently from these Writers. They, from what they imagine, *could not be*, would prove it *was not*. I, from what I prove *was not*, shew afterwards what *could not be*. But he saw not this, that the People's *not having* the Doctrine was a necessary Consequence of *Moses's not teaching* it. And no wonder, when we consider how he came by his Principle, that he should understand none of its Consequences. Hence it is that he so ignorantly accuses me of *having confounded these two things throughout my Book*. That is, of taking Advantage

tage of, and, all the way, inforcing a necessary Consequence from a certain Principle.

But, one Word more with him on this Head. He says, *Moses had it not in Commission*. What thinks he of the Book of *Job*? He says he thinks of it very *differently from me*. It is prudently said, and enough to secure his Credit, and keep him orthodox. We will for once support his Modesty; and conceive him to hold, that the Book was written by *Moses*; and that the famous Text, in the nineteenth Chapter, relates to the Resurrection. But then what becomes of the *Principle* of *Moses's no Commission*? Or will he say *Moses* did not write it, and that the Text in the nineteenth Chapter does not relate to a Resurrection? What then becomes of his *Orthodoxy*? See now what it is to be shirking the Principles of the Profane. Common Sense cries out against this un sanctified Commerce,

Veto esse tale luminis commercium.

If the good Man will believe me, he is out of his way. I would advise him to return again as fast as he can into the old *Dunstable* Road of *Moses* and a future State for ever. This was only an intemperate Fit of Zeal that hurried him half Seas over, before he knew where he was, or had time to look about him. For what is it he is doing? “ *Moses* instituted the Whole of an entire new
“ Religion: enjoins nothing to be added to, nor
“ taken from it: Purposely omits the Doctrine
“ of a future State, because it was not in his
“ Commission, but reserved for the great Re-
“ deemer of Mankind; and yet the People, to
“ whom he gave this Religion, *had* the Doctrine
“ of

“ of a future State as of National Belief, all along
 “ from his time, to the Captivity, tho’ we can
 “ find no Footsteps or Traces of it in their Hi-
 “ story.”

Credat JUDÆUS Apella,

may, I believe, be given in answer to this Man’s Creed with greater Propriety than ever it was applied since *Horace* first used it. After this, Is such a Writer to be argued with? To talk of a Doctrine not being in the Commission of a Minister of God, because it was reserved for a future Age; and yet that the People on whom his Ministry was employed had all along this very Doctrine, is a Mockery both of God and Man. For why was not *Moses* permitted to teach it, but because the Knowledge of it was reserved for a future Age? Or if they were then taught it, or had it, what hindered but *Moses* might have taught it? Be not deceived; as *God is not mocked*, so neither does he mock his Creatures. In short, this Reasoning of my Adversary is, *verbis tollere, re ponere*, the Reverse of the *Epicurean*: But perhaps he may like it the better for it, as ’tis paying those *Jewish Epicureans*, the *Sadducees*, in Kind: And with this Class of Answerers the Reverse of *Wrong* is always *Right*. But I am quite ashamed of my Anonymous. — Let the Reader only take notice, that this is the sole Point now remaining in Dispute between us.

3. As to the *Palmary* Argument, (of a future State of Rewards and Punishments not being known to the *Jews*, or making part of their national Doctrine from *Moses* to the Captivity) taken from the Consideration of *their whole History*,

S as

130 A P P E N D I X.

as delivered in the Bible ; which the Reader has an Account of in p. 102. of this *Review*, our Answerer has not so much as attempted to touch upon it: Tho' against him, who owns *Moses* neither did, nor could teach a future State, it comes with a redoubled Bound. Indeed at page 102². of his Pamphlet, he has the *Courage* to quote it in part, and still greater neither to pretend to answer it, nor to confess its Force; but, to end all, he drops it in this manner.—*Why truly, Sir, there is a Difficulty in conceiving it: And yet were the Case as you have represented it, I should not venture to call it a DEMONSTRATION. Mere negative Proofs are of all others most uncertain &c. Venture!* Why I see you dare not venture so much as to look it in the Face. And what you may call it behind its Back, will be but the railing of a baffled Coward. No, your Genius has directed you to a fitter Task; and you go on to prove that the Body of the *Jews* had the Doctrine, from Texts nothing relating to the Matter, but such as have been forced into this Service by *Jews* and System-makers — as, *Days of Pilgrimage — being gather'd to their Fathers — giving up the Ghost — God's bringing every Work into Judgment — the Righteous having Hope in his Death — David's Hope being in God — his being a Stranger and Sojourner* — And the Joke of it is, he tells me I might have found out this Meaning in them too, had I but consulted his *Commentators*. And with this miserable *recocta crambe* his whole Pamphlet is stuffed out from Side to Side.

4. I had

APPENDIX. 131

4. I had introduced my Evidence from the Writers of the New Testament in this manner. "But what is of greatest Weight, the inspired Writers of the New Testament expressly declare the same. They assure us that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments did *not* make part of the *Mosaic* Dispensation^f." On which our Writer thus remarks: "The Christian Reader perhaps may be at a Loss to know why the Testimony of the inspired Writers of the *New* Testament should be of *greater* Weight in this Case than the inspired Writers of the *Old*. But what is worse, Unbelievers (for whose Conviction I presume your Demonstration is intended) may ask by what Right the Authors of the New Testament came to be admitted as Evidence who lived at the Distance of so many hundred Years, &c." § Which shall we here most admire? the charitable Insinuation in the first part? or the shrewd Remark in the second? Thou Flower of Divines! I did not say that the *Testimony* of the inspired Writers of the *New* Testament has greater Weight than an equal Testimony of the inspired Writers of the *Old*. But that their Testimony in the Case in hand had greater Weight, as (in the Opinion of such as you whom I am here endeavouring in vain to convince) a positive Proof by express Declaration, is stronger than a *Negative* arising from an Omission. It was but just before this very Man was quarrelling with *negative* Evidence. *But what is worse*, says he, *Unbelievers*

^f D. L. B. v. S. vi. init.

§ Page 66.

may

may ask, &c. What! that which nothing concerns them? I had observed over and over that they all agreed to *this Truth*, and that therefore, *in this Part*, I addressed myself to *Believers*. But ashamed himself of this Disingenuity, he retracts his own Objection:—*But as I am arguing*, says he, *with you on Christian Principles*, I can have no Benefit from this Plea^h. And was not I arguing with him, as well as he with me? Can he blush for this or must I?

5. In Sect. vi. of the fifth Book of the *Div. Leg.* where I endeavour to prove the *minor* Proposition from the New Testament, I introduce the Discourse thus, “This Evidence may be divided “into two Parts, the *first* proving that temporal “Rewards and Punishments were the Sanction “of the *Jewish* Dispensation; the *second*, that “it had no otherⁱ.” Now let the Reader turn to this Writer p. 67. & seq. and he will see how, by the vilest Prevarication, he has argued against the *first* sort brought by me to prove *temporal Rewards the Sanction*, as if I had brought them to the same Purpose with the *second*, namely to prove, that there was *no other*.

6. With the same Spirit it is that he endeavours to make me contradict myself^k, where in one place^l, speaking of the Patriarchs, (who I own, referring to *Heb.* chap. xi. v. 13. and 14. *saw the Promises afar off and were persuaded &c.*) I say that *even they*, the sacred Writer assures us, *had not received the Promises*, referring to v. 39. And, in another place^m, speaking of the same 39th Verse, I say the sacred Writer is speaking here of *the faithful Israelites in general*. Hence this

^h Page 67.

ⁱ Div. Leg. 2^d Vol. p. 470.

^k Page 97.

^l Div. Leg. Vol. ii p. 582.

^m Pag. 591.
great

APPENDIX. 133

great Critic says I am guilty of a manifest *Contradiction*, and laments in his kind way, *that these Passages are both suffered to stand to shame one another*, p. 97. They shall stand for a better Purpose, to *shame* all such Scribblers as are not yet come to their Elements; and don't so much as know that *omne majus continet in se minus*. For if in Verse 39 the sacred Writer be speaking of the faithful *Israelites* in general, had I not Reason to say from thence, *that EVEN the Patriarchs* were included? However, he might at least have understood so much *English* as to know that the Conjunction *even* implies not *Exclusion*, but *Extension*.

7. He insults me, and puzzles himself with this Question, "If the ancient Heathen Legislators taught it [a future State] or if the main Body of the *Jewish* Nation believed it before the coming of *Christ*, how was it brought to light by the Gospel? If this Text will stand with supposing that the general Knowledge of a future State was generally received amongst the *Jews* from the Time of the *Maccabees* down to *Christ*, will you be pleased to inform me why it will not as well stand with supposing that they had this Doctrine for as many Ages backward." — And for fear I should not answer him, (as indeed he had Reason) he answers it himself. *To bring to Light does not here signify to discover what before was absolutely unknown. It signifies THEREFORE the more open or public Manifestation of what before was known either imperfectly or but to a fewⁿ. Egregious Divine! If it does not signify that (you say) it*

ⁿ Page 72, 73.

must

134 A P P E N D I X.

must signify *this*. Beat your Brains no further : For once I'll tell you, it signifies *neither* ; but (what your Systems never dreamt of) that this was the first Time of its being *revealed by God*, either to the *Jewish* People as a Nation, or to Mankind in general. The sacred Writer did not deign to call that, *bringing to light*, which was hatched in the bosom of Superstition, and soon became polluted with a thousand Fables in passing thro' the impure Hands of System-making *Jews* and *Gentiles*. From whence I reasonably concluded it was never taught *by God* to the *Jewish* People throughout the Period in question. What was taught *by Man* is another thing, and entirely out of the question. But you don't understand this : I believe so : Nor, I will say that for you, scarce any one general Proposition throughout my whole Book.

8. I said, that the Doctrine of a future Life and Resurrection was not national till the Time of the *Maccabees*. He tells me, he *knows I will say that they had it from the Prophets, yet the Prophets were dead two hundred Years before. Why then* (says he) *could not the Jews learn this Doctrine from the very first as well as their Posterity at the Distance of Ages afterwards*° ? This sorely distresses our Theologaster : Yet instead of humbling himself under the Weight of his own Dulness, he turns, as is his Way throughout, to insult the Author of the *Divine Legation*. Now, tho' this Usage deserve no Favour, I will try to open his Understanding. — The Prophets had expressed a *temporal Destruction* and *Restoration* in the figurative Terms of *Death* and *Resurrection*. This

° Page 112, 113.

APPENDIX. 135

being agreeable to the Language of those Times, the People, full only of Ideas of a temporal Nature, rested in the *primary* Sense. But when by the total withdrawing the *extraordinary* Providence of God, these People (who had right Notions of his Being and Attributes) had once begun to entertain the reasonable Hopes of a future State; they would then as naturally search their Scriptures for Support. And then it was they first began to understand that those Prophecies had a *secondary* Sense, and a sublimer Meaning. In this Sense, and on this Account it is that I say, *they received the Doctrine of the Resurrection from the Prophets*. If he ask me, with his usual Insolence, how I come to know that they received the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* from the Prophets, I will tell him this too, which is more than his *Geneva* Systems could inform him of, that the Doctrine was no where else to be *had*. If all this will not satisfy him, let us turn the Tables, while *I question* him. The Prophets prophesy of the Birth, Office, Death, and Passion of *Jesus*. The *Jews* in general, till the coming of *Christ*, and some time after, mistook this Prophecy for the Promise of a *temporal Deliverer*, quite different from the *Messiah* of Mankind: Yet, after the Resurrection, they understood better. *How so?* I ask in his own Words, *Is it likely that the Sons should have learnt from the dead Prophets what the Fathers could not learn from the Living?* He would be hard put to it, I believe, for a pertinent Reply, without condescending to use the Answer I have provided for him above.—What is here

136 APPENDIX.

said will serve for an Answer to the same kind of Objection urged again at page 50. where, from my owning that some Passages, which relate *literally* to temporal Things, had a *spiritual* and sublimer Meaning, he supposes the *Jews* of those Times must needs have found it out.

9. Again, "Tho' here (says he) you seem to be of Opinion that it will in *nothing* affect the Practice of Virtue whether a future State is believed or not, provided the Will of God is allowed to be the Foundation of Morality; yet, in your Preface to the *Jews*, you tell them that the *Jewish Religion* must want much of absolute Perfection because it wants a Doctrine so essential to Religion. It is inexplicable to me, Sir, how that should be essential to Religion, by the Want of which the Practice of Virtue will in nothing be affected^q." — And are you indeed so dull as you pretend? or is this only a Mask for your Modesty, to hide your Blushes, for so shameless a Prevarication? What Man living but your learned self does not see, that where I speak, in the first Case, of the Practice of Virtue, on, what I call, the true *Foundation of Morality*^r, I am considering it under an *extraordinary* Providence amongst the *Jews* of old: And where, in the *Preface*, of a future State as essential to Religion, I am considering it under an *ordinary and common* Providence, amongst the *Jews*^s of the present Times? Yet in this very Page^t has this Man the modest Assurance to say, TRUTH IS WHAT I SEEK. — It may possibly be so; and therefore I will take a little more

^q Page 130, 131.
2d Vol.

^s Page 23.

^r Page 586, 587. of *Div. Leg.*
^t Page 131.

Pains with him. What then, let me ask him, has the *Purity* of Virtue to do with the *Perfection* of Religion, so as that they must necessarily imply one another; and I be accused of Contradiction, for saying, that the *Jewish* Virtue was *pure*, and yet their Religion *imperfect*? Will not this very Man himself say the same Thing, tho', I ween, for different Reasons? But do the different Reasons of an Assertion, make the same Assertion a *Contradiction* in me, and a *plain Truth* in him? Allow him but a future State for his *Jews*, and their Virtue, then, becomes *pure*: But will he say their Religion is *perfect*? But, because there can be no *perfect* Religion without *pure* Virtue, he concluded the other way, that there could be no *pure* Virtue without a *perfect* Religion; and so has caught me in his Contradiction-Trap, which he has laid, with the same Success, I don't know how often throughout the Course of this Debate.

And here the judicious Reader, I am sure, can't but smile to see him insinuate^v, with a Sneer, that Bishop *Bull* must needs be a Stranger to my Scheme, as he thinks it, of *moral Obligation*. He supposed, in good earnest, the Bishop could read his Bible, as he has done, without seeing that the *Ground* of this *Obligation* is *there* made to be *the Will of God*. But this it is to have to do with a Head, whose Sense is all run to System.

10. Once more. In that miserable sophistical Shuffle with those few of my Arguments, on the *Case of Abraham*, which he dares venture to encounter in his *Appendix*, he brings it as a *Contradiction*, that, after I had said, the Information, conveyed in the Command to offer *Isaac*, was

138 *A P P E N D I X.*

for *Abraham's sole Use*, I should then suppose his *Family* knew of it. And in this he triumphs with his usual Vivacity and Success *. Here again I am at a Loss, as things are so equally balanced, to know which was at Fault in this Place, his Head or Heart; but no matter: They are both past my mending. I will turn to the Reader.—Where I speak of the Information's being given for *Abraham's sole Use*, I am assigning a Reason for the Obscurity of the historical Relation, so far as concerns the *Information*, which I supposed to be conveyed in the Command: consequently, *his sole Use*, is opposed to the *Jewish People*, when the *History of the Command* was written; and not to his own *Family*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, when the *Command* was given; whom I all along reckon amongst those Patriarchs who had some Knowledge of the Redemption of Mankind—Suppose it should be thought proper to give this Man a *Dignity* for *his Works' Sake*, in *this Labour of Love*; and he should be told it was for his *sole Use*; he would be apt, I suspect, to think that this rather excluded the Body of the Poor and Needy, than his own dear Family.

11. Again, — “Nor (says he) will the *Pagan* “Fable of *Diana's* substituting a Hind in the “Place of *Iphigenia* at all help your Unbeliever. “*This did not*, say you, *make Idolaters believe* “*that she therefore abhorred human Sacrifices*. “But do not they themselves, or have not you “assigned a very proper and sufficient Reason “why it did not, viz. that *they had been before* “*persuaded to the contrary*. Where human Sa- “crifices make a part of the settled, standing

* Page 167, 168.

APPENDIX. 139

“ Religion ; the Refusal to accept a human Sacrifice in one particular Instance, may indeed rather be looked upon as a particular Indulgence than as a Declaration against the thing in gross. But where the thing was commanded but in one single Instance, and the Command revoked in that very Instance (which is our present Case) such Revocation in all reasonable Construction is as effectual a Condemnation of the thing as if God had told *Abraham*, in so many Words, that he delighted not in such Sacrifices.” I quote this out of mere Charity, because it looks like Sense ; and is the only thing that does so throughout the whole Pamphlet. But this fair Appearance is only in Profile. What it has on one Side, it wants on another ; and betrays the grossest Ignorance of Antiquity. At this very time human Sacrifices had overspread the Superstition of *Canaan*. And thence it is that the Deist’s Argument receives its Force. The Family of *Abraham*, say they, who found the same Practice commanded him which they saw esteemed by all the *Pagans* round about as the sublimest Hight of Piety, a Practice, as appears from Scripture, not *positively* forbidden but by the Law of *Moses*, would, in the Case they put, be naturally tempted to think as favourably of it as those *Pagans*, who understood that *Diana* required *Iphigenia*, tho’ she accepted a Hind in her stead.

12. After all these Victories, he may be well excused the interposing with his own Good Will and Pleasure. “ If it is your Intention (says he) to proceed, and it were not too great a Pre-

“sumption in me to offer my Advice; it should
 “be to lay the Weight of your Argument,
 “not upon *this*, that the *Jews knew nothing* of
 “a future State; but upon *this*, that the *Law*
 “of *Moses* had made *no Provision* for it. If
 “THIS PRINCIPLE IS ALL YOU WANT, IT
 “WILL STAND, and you will have nothing to an-
 “swer for, but the ill Judgment of advancing
 “and taking so much Pains to support another
 “Point with which your Conclusion has nothing
 “to do.” Goodly and gracious! Here he
 shews how capable a *Reader* he is of the *Divine*
Legation. He confesses not to know whether
this Principle is all I want to establish my De-
 monstration; and yet he will turn *Answerer*.
 But what the Connexion of a long Chain of Rea-
 soning hindered him from seeing, I hope this
 short *View* will bring to Light: And that the
second Syllogism will inform him, that WHAT HE
 GRANTS IS ALL I WANT. For if *Moses* would
 leave his People to get or keep a Doctrine
 as they could, so necessary and believed by
 him to be so necessary, under an *ordinary Provi-*
dence, to Religion and Society, we must needs
 conclude, he was well assured, that his Institution
 could do without it; or, in other Words, that
 the Defect would be supplied by the Administra-
 tion of an *extraordinary Providence*. The Dispute,
 therefore, seems now to be at an End between us.
 He owns, I have gained my Point: That I have
 got to the Goal: All that he would now dispute
 with me is the Road. I must take the Track he
 marks out to me; and *I have nothing to answer*
for but the ill Judgment of advancing and taking

APPENDIX 141

so much Pains to support another Point with which my Conclusion has nothing to do. Say you so, kind Sir? with what Face then could you tell the World, just before, that, *I ought to make Amends for the Wrong I have done to Religion in the second Volume of the Divine Legation, in which, instead of placing Christianity on a surer Bottom, I have only furnished out more Handles to Unbelievers*^a? What! Is proving the Divinity of Moses's Religion, a Thing for which I ought to make Amends and repent, as a *Wrong* done to Christianity? Suppose I was willing to support the Proof in a Way you do not like; you confess that, in this, *I have nothing to answer for but the ILL JUDGMENT of taking Pains to support another Point with which my Conclusion has nothing to do.* Am I therefore, for my *ill Judgment*, to be ranked amongst the injurious Subverters of Revelation? What then will become of you? But such as these seem to care little whether Religion be true or false, unless it can be supported on their Systems. They had been bred up in the Belief that the old *Jews*, as well as their *Law*, were *spiritual*, and then

— *Turpe putant parere minoribus, & quæ
Imberbes didicere, senes perdenda fateri.*

After this, it was in vain for the Apostle to tell them, in the Person of a Jew, *We know that the Law is SPIRITUAL, but I am CARNAL.* However let him set his Heart at rest (if at least the Conscience of so unjust a Calumny will suffer him.) For tho' this Principle, *that the Law of Moses made no Provision for a future State*, be all I

^a Page 132.

want

want to support my Demonstration; yet I mean, I can assure him, to secure it with this other, *that the Body of the Jews for some Ages knew nothing of it.* This I should do were it for nothing else but that 'tis a TRUTH offensive to Bigots and their Systems; by which they have done their best to render both the *Word of God*, and Reason of Man, *of no Effect.* But I have weightier Motives: I shall make it serve for the noblest Purposes of religious Truth and Piety.

But why do I speak of these Matters to him; who is so exceeding ignorant even of the very *Forms* of Argument, that, having given us to understand that he saw I had finished the *major* Proposition in the first Volume, and the *minor* in the second, he goes on thus — “As your *Conclusion* is to be the Subject of a future Book, “I think I have no Right to meddle with it at “present. I will prejudge you in nothing, and “shall therefore leave you at full Liberty to CON- “NECT IT WITH YOUR PREMISES, as you “shall find yourself able^a.” Here he plainly appears not to understand *what natural Connection* there is between the *Major*, *Minor*, and *Conclusion*. I had learnt that the CONCLUSION had been CONNECTED with the PREMISES by *Aristotle* long ago; but it seems, so unhappy still am I, that the thing is yet to do. Thanks indeed to this merciful Divine! — *I am left at full Liberty to do it, as I shall find myself able.*

13. But one Word more, and I have done. “Whether (says he) you intend to proceed, or “will suffer yourself to be wholly diverted from

^a Page 4.

“ your Purpose by Matters of another kind *less*
 “ *suitable to your clerical Function, you best know.*
 “ But give me leave to say, Sir, you are a
 “ Debtor to the Public; and I hope that in your
 “ next Volume you will make some *amends*, for
 “ the *Wrong you have done to Religion in this* ;
 “ in which, instead of placing Christianity upon
 “ a surer bottom, you have only furnished out
 “ *more Handles to Unbelievers* ^b.” I scarce know
 whether I am not to take this for pure Kindness,
 and a sort of friendly Impatience for my third
 Volume: Which certainly, if it would hold, he
 has contrived a very speedy Way to obtain: And
 that is by proving it a *Debt*. And this at least
 I will do him the Justice to say, that if I be a
Debtor to the Public, it must be for the Reason
 he so candidly suggests, or none at all. But alas!
 he has, as a good Friend in the like Case might
 have, his Doubts and his Fears. He questions
 whether I will not suffer myself to be wholly
 diverted from my Purpose by Matters of another
 kind *less suitable to my clerical Function*. Less
 suitable than what? why, according to him, than
writing to the Wrong and Injury of Religion, and
giving more Handles to Unbelievers. What I am
 then *diverted* by, must be very *unsuitable* in-
 deed. But will the good Man be so kind to tell
 us what this *Diversion* is? Thank you for that
 indeed. As Things are now carried, and left in
 the Dark, who knows but the Reader, in Excess
 of Charity, may take it to be a Whore, or a
 Horse-race, or a good Job of Simony; a Party
 Pamphlet, or Levy-hunting, or Exchange Alley,
 or, in short, twenty Things besides; each of

^b Page 132.

them sufficient to discredit the mere unorthodox Man. With this good Luck, I make no Doubt, but he would *wipe his Mouth* and applaud his innocent Address. Well then, since the Meanness and Malignity of his Heart won't suffer *him* to tell, *I* will. The *Diversión* he hints at, and yet dare not name, is a Critical Defence and Illustration of the Writings of one of the greatest Geniuses of this, or indeed of any Age, to convince the Prejudiced and Ignorant, that the incomparable Writer hath been always on the Side of Truth, Virtue, and Religion. And now the Secret is out. In the mean time, I dare suppose, that our *Anonymous* holds it as a Thing very *suitable to clerical Profession*, to calumniate his Brother only for differing from him in Opinion, tho' in the Support of that very Cause which himself pretends to espouse. I give *Handles to Unbelievers*, while I endeavour to prove an *extraordinary Providence*, administred in the *Jewish Republic*, a Fact, by the Truth or Falshood of which, the Religion of *Moses* must stand or fall. But this Man and his Fellows, it seems, give none, who, in writing against me, are so far from saying one Word in its *behalf*, that they seem rather to treat it as a Vision of the Author of the *D. L.* This Writer particularly, seems to have given no obscure Intimations, up and down his Pamphlet, that he believes nothing of the Matter. But how has my saying, that the Doctrine was not national, but unknown to the Body of the *Jewish* People between the Times of *Moses* and the Captivity, given more *Handles to Unbelievers*? Was I the first Broacher of the Opinion? Look upon the three great Testimonies above. Or would it have remain'd hid, had I not divulged it? Has this Man

never heard of the present Overflow of Infidelity? Or has he ever heard of *one Deist* that believed a future State to be a national Doctrine amongst the *Jews* within the Period aforesaid? Or, to be plain with him, is there indeed more than a few Bigots like himself that now believe it? What was then to be done? Here was a very general Opinion, grounded upon common Sense, supposed to be discreditable to Revelation. I examined it. On Examination it appeared to me a Truth. Was I to disguise or hide it (according to the Principle and Practices of these Men) because it gave Scandal? Far be those Arts from every Minister of the Gospel! I well knew if it were a Truth, it would never hurt Revelation. I chose then to give Glory to Truth; and, in that, to the God of Truth: and, by so doing, I became enabled to demonstrate to Unbelievers that this, which they esteemed a Discredit to the Religion of *Moses*, was a convincing Mark of its Divinity. And for this, and this only, I am said by this Writer to *have wronged Religion, and given more Handles to Infidelity*. But I forgive him, and pray that God, whose holy Religion I am defending, may forgive him too.

14. But the Reader, by this time, must needs be curious to know what it was that could provoke our *Anonymous* to write with so much Acrimony against his Brother, embarked with him in the same Cause of Religion, while there were so many *Infidel-writers* remaining unanswered,

Cumque superba foret Babylon spolianda trophæis.
And for what? a Vision, no body will thank him for, unless it be half a Dozen Bigots: Always excepting the venerable *Jewish Church*, of which
U he

146 A P P E N D I X.

he has shewn himself so zealous a Support. She surely owes him her best Acknowledgments for keeping her Children close attached to her, and hardening them in their Infidelity. For, were it not for this inveterate Error, they had long since come over to the Faith of *Jesus*, there being then nothing to obstruct their Sight in the manifest *Imperfection of the Law*: to prevent which, their Leaders, as the great *Episcopus* informs us, took so much Pains (so well seconded here by our *Anonymous*) to ASSERT THE FAITH OF THE ANCIENT JEWISH CHURCH; and to prove, that their Forefathers always had the Doctrine of a future State. *Quicquid nunc Judæi multum de futuro seculo de Resurrectione mortuorum, de vita æterna loquantur, & ex Legis verbis ea extorquere potius quam ostendere conentur, NE LEGEM MOSIS IMPERFECTAM ESSE cogantur agnoscere*^a. For he cannot sure be so weak to think it possible, that, when he has agreed with them, that their *Church* always had a future State, they will agree with him, that *Moses* did not teach it. All this considered, it would have been very difficult to divine his *Motive* for writing against me, had not he himself fairly, and without Disguise, informed us of it, in the very Entrance on his Work. Not to mince the Matter, it was that *little Reputation*, (yet *more* than he could bear) which, it seems, the *Divine Legation* had accidentally bestowed upon its Author. — “ That you have given (says our “ *Anonymous*) great Proofs of your Learning and “ Ingenuity I shall not dispute: And you have “ had a fair Time allowed you to receive the “ COMPLIMENTS OF THE PUBLIC on that Score.

^a See the Quot. above.

“ It may now be seasonable to call you to something, which; though perhaps less agreeable to you, may yet be more profitable ; and that is, to consider how much Truth you have advanced, and what real Service you have done, or are likely to do to Religion by this Undertaking ^b.” And why will he not *dispute the great Proofs of my Learning and Ingenuity*? He has disputed a more incontestable thing; the Truth, which that *Learning and Ingenuity* were employed to illustrate: and, if these appeared with any Distinction, it was solely owing to the Advantage of the *Subject*.

But *I have had a fair Time allowed me to receive the Compliments of the Public*. How allowed me? and by whom? certainly not by such Writers as these. For if their Clamours could have prevailed, I had received the *public Odium* rather than its *Compliments*. And the Reader may see, by the short List given of them in the Beginning of this Pamphlet, that those Clamours begun the very Moment the first Volume of the *Divine Legation* appeared; and have continued ever since, without Interruption, to the Publication of our Author's *Epistolary Dissertation*.

But after all, what were these *Compliments*? And where have they lain hid? Nothing, from the Public, ever came to my Knowledge but the *Calumnies* of my Adversaries. In some Sense, indeed, these may be called *Compliments*, and substantial ones too. For, next to the *old* way of complimenting, *Laudari a laudato Viro*, I prize the *new*, now all in Fashion, *vituperari a perditissimo quoque*. He, perhaps, may think the Sale

of the Book a good substantial Compliment. But, for that, my Bookseller must thank them; especially if he gave them not their Pennyworth for their Money.

However, to take these *Compliments* in their obvious Sense. I know of nothing for which I had more Reason to expect *the Compliments of the Public* than for *the Alliance between Church and State*, as it was a Defence (and I will presume, from its being yet unanswered, an *effectual* one) of the Justice and Equity of our present happy Establishment; at a Time when the Enemies of all Church Establishments were commonly supposed to have demonstrated it to be indefensible. Yet what *public Compliment* did I ever receive for this Service? unless it may be reckoned a Compliment, that those, in whose Behalf it was particularly written, have never yet publicly disavowed the free and moderate Principles on which it goes. But *that*, the honest Layman will perhaps say is no bad Compliment to themselves.

I am here all along pleading for my Adversary. For had I *indeed* received the *Compliments* he talks of, he would find it very difficult to bring his *Modesty* off unhurt. The *wrong Judgment of the Public* being, in *that* Case, the principal Object of his Pamphlet: the Drift of which is to shew that I *deserved no Compliment*, as I had confounded and mistaken the Question, run into Contradictions, and done Injury to Christianity: Nay, even in this very place, where he talks of the *great Proofs of my Learning and Ingenuity*, he cannot forbear insinuating that I have *advanced no Truth, nor done any real Service to Religion*. Miserable then, indeed, is that *Learning and Ingenuity*! Well does he say he would not *dispute* them

them. For, for any thing they are worth, there they may lye; and he may safely trust to Time to revenge his Quarrel on them.

From all this then, we must conclude that these *public Compliments* are but the *Mormos* of his own Brain: Things he rather *feared* than *saw*; and that through the false Consciousness of a supposed Worth he is no Judge of. In this troublesome Situation, the only way he had of *easing himself* was to attempt to give *me Pain*; indeed the only *Ease* such Writers are capable of, when they see, or imagine they see, a *Merit* in others. *It is time* (says he) *to call you to something less agreeable.*

Well, but if it be, as he promises, *more profitable*, he makes me sufficient amends. And there was no Danger of his not keeping his Word: For an Use is always to be made of the Calumnies of one's Enemies. Besides, it must be a poor thing indeed that will not afford more *Profit* than the airy Complements he talks of: Which were they as real as, for ought appears, they are imaginary, I solemnly assure him, I would give them all for the honest Satisfaction of having made one single Convert; and I have Reason to hope I have made many by my Writings, from Irreligion to the Faith of *Jesus*.

However, the *Profit I may get* by an Adversary is one thing; and the *Profit he may propose* is another. Let us see then what our *Anonymous* aims at. *It is* (he tells us) *to consider how much Truth I have advanced, or what real Service I have done, or am likely to do to Religion by this Undertaking.* Modestly intimating, that I have advanced no Truth; done no real Service, nor likely to do any to Religion. And now, methinks, I hear the
equitable

equitable and indignant Reader crying out, *Sume superbiam*, &c. And certainly if this Liberty may be allowed in any Case, it must in this, where a Man's honest Endeavours, in his proper Station, to serve his Country and Mankind, are blackened by the dull low Envy of an anonymous Slanderer. What! *Was it advancing no Truth, was it doing no Service to Religion*, to confute the Atheistic Principles of *Bayle*, the immoral Doctrine of *Mandevile*, and settling Morality on its true Basis, and shewing it to be that on which Revelation hath placed it? To justify the Equity of an established Religion; vindicate the Christian from the Charge of a persecuting Spirit; shew the absolute Necessity of Religion for the Support of Society, and yet that it had its Original, neither from Priests nor Statesmen, but from Truth, and Truth's great Author? Again, *Was it advancing no Truth, was it doing no Service to Religion*, to shew that the *Mosaic* had all the distinguishing Marks of Divinity; to vindicate the Bible History against the greatest modern Philosopher and Chronologer; to explain the Nature of the *Jewish* Theocracy, and, by that, to justify the Equity of those two famous Laws, of *punishing for Opinions*, and *punishing Posterity for the Crimes of their Forefathers*; to confute the most able Book ever wrote against Revelation, *the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*; and, above all, to explain, and to be the *first* who ever did explain, the Nature of *Types* in Action, and *secondary Senses* in Speech, on which, depend altogether the rational Interpretation of ancient Prophecies, and the Truth of the Mission of *Jesus*. — But for the further Confutation of so wretched a Calumny, the Reader need only turn back

APPENDIX. 151

back again to the *View* I have here given of the *Argument* of the *Divine Legation*. Yet none of these Matters, no, nor an hundred more, has he so much as touched upon, or pretended to confute. Will he say therefore that these are not what he meant, when he promised to shew, *that I had advanced no Truth, done no real Service to Religion?* But only my *peculiar* Argument for the *Divine Legation* of Moses. Why then did he make his *Charge* so general, when his *Proof* was so confined? As his Modesty will not suffer him to tell, it shall be helped out. The Reader then must know, that it is a fundamental Maxim with all the Writers of this Class (as it is amongst the *Jesuits*) never to acknowledge that an Adversary can do any thing *well*, lest the Public should take it into their Heads that other things are not so ill as is represented. This is the wicked Spirit of Controversy, and under the Possession of it I leave him. For I am ashamed of having wasted a Moment with so unprofitable a Writer.

The judicious Reader I am sure would not excuse me if he thought many were so misemploy'd. The Truth is, the reading his Book, (which is the first I ever read thro', of all that have been hitherto wrote against me) and the writing this *Appendix* took me up but a Part only of this one Evening. Tho' I have answered every thing in it worth Notice: or that had the least Chance of misleading a well meaning Reader. However, if he will tell his Name, and shew his Face; and it appears that the one has been heard of, or the other ever seen in good Company, I do hereby promise to give his *Considerations on the Case of Abraham, &c.* a distinct Answer, Paragraph by Paragraph, in the Manner
of

152 A P P E N D I X.

of *that*, to one much his Betters, the truly learned and worthy Editor of the Book of *Job*. Nay, I will do more for his Encouragement: I will shew as particular a Respect to the *rest* of his Pamphlet; but on this further Condition however, that he, at the same time, produce me some one competent Judge who shall say, on his Credit, that it deserves any other Answer than what has been already given to it. But without this, a final Adieu to his *Nameless Nothing*; but with this Testimony however, that a duller, a more disingenuous, or ignorant Book I never read.

December 17. 1743.



P O S T.

POSTSCRIPT.

I HAVE said, that all this *Writer* has urged, from *Texts* of Scripture to prove a *future State* in the *Jewish* Dispensation, is so utterly contemptible, and void of Sense, as to deserve no kind of Answer. But that he may not flatter himself in the Imagination of any other Cause of my Neglect of him, I shall here examine a single *Objection*, (sent me in a private *anonymous Letter*) which has more Plausibility of Reason than all his Arguments, on this Head, put together. And, as the Author's manner of communicating it, has the Appearance of Candour and Love of Truth, he will always deserve more Regard than a thousand such Writers as the *Examiner of the second Proposition*. The Objection is in these Words: "*Moses* inforces the Obedience of the *Israelites* upon this Consideration, *Ye shall therefore keep my Statutes and Judgments, which if a Man do he shall live in them*". Here is a Promise of Life made to those who should observe the Statutes and Judgments which God gave them by his Servant *Moses*; which cannot be understood of this temporal Life only, because the best Men were often cut off in the midst of their Days, and frequently suffer'd greater Adversities than the most profligate Sinners. The *Jews* therefore have constantly believed that it had a respect to

^c Levit. xviii. 5.

X

" the

154 POSTSCRIPT.

“ the Life to come. When the Lawyer in the
 “ Gospel had made that most important Demand,
 “ *Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal Life* ^d,
 “ our blessed Lord refers him to what was written
 “ in the Law; and, upon his making a found
 “ and judicious Answer, approves of it; and for
 “ Satisfaction to his Question tells him, *This do,*
 “ *and thou shalt live.*”—The Objection is very in-
 genious; and, as we shall see, not less *artfully*
 managed.

The Objector would have the Promise of *Life*
 in *Leviticus* to signify *eternal Life*. But St. Paul
 himself has long ago moderated this Question for
 us, and declared for the negative. A Dispute a-
 rose between him, and the Judaizing Christians,
 concerning *what it was that justified before God,*
 or intitled to that *eternal Life* brought to light by
 the Gospel. They held it to be the *Works of the*
Law (*believing*, perhaps, as the Objector assures
 us they did, that this Text, in *Leviticus*, *had a re-*
spect to the Life to come :) St. Paul, on the contra-
 ry, that it was *Faith in Jesus the Messiah*. And
 thus he argues—“ But that no Man is justified by
 “ the Law in the Sight of God it is evident: for
 “ *the just shall live by Faith*. And the Law is
 “ not of Faith, but the Man that *doth* them
 “ shall live in them ^e.”—As much as to say—
 That no Man can obtain *eternal Life* by virtue of
 the *Law* is evident from one of your own Pro-
 phets [*Hab.*] who expressly says, that *the just shall*
 LIVE by FAITH ^f. Now, by the *Law*, no Re-
 wards are promised to *Faith*, but to *Works only*.
The Man that doth them (says the *Law*, in
Levit. ^g) *shall live in them*.—Here then we see that

^d Luke x. 25.

^e Gal. iii. 11, 12.

^f ii. 4.

^g xviii. 5.

this very *Text* which the Objector brings to prove *eternal Life by the Law*, St. *Paul* urges, to prove it *not by the Law*. Let us attend to the Apostle's Argument. He is to shew, that *Justification*, or *eternal Life*, is by *Faith*. This he does, even on the Concession of a *Jew*, the Prophet *Habakkuk*; who expressly owns it to be by *Faith*. But the *Law*, says the Apostle, attributes nothing to *Faith*; but, to *Deeds* only, "which if a Man *do* he shall live in them." Now, if, by *Life*, be here meant, as the Objector supposes, *eternal Life*, then St. *Paul*'s Argument does not come out as he intended it; namely, *that Faith and not the Works of the Law justify*; but thus, *that both Faith and the Works of the Law justify*, which would have satisfied these *Judaizers*, (as reconciling, on their own Prejudices, *Moses* and *Habakkuk*;) but, by no means, our Apostle; whose Conclusion on this Question (where discussed at large, in his Epistle to the *Romans*) is, *that a Man is justified by Faith WITHOUT the Deeds of the Law*^h. The very Drift of his Argument therefore shews us, that he must necessarily understand the *Life*, promised in this Text of *Leviticus*, to be TEMPORAL *Life only*. But charitably studious, as it were, to prevent all possible Chance of our mistaking him on so important a Point, he immediately subjoins, *Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law*ⁱ. Now we know that our *Redemption* by *Christ* was from that Death which the first Man brought into the World: This was the *Curse* he entailed upon his Posterity. The Apostle's transferring this Term from *Adam* to the *Law* shews, therefore, that, in his Sentiments, the *Law* had no more a Share in

^h Gal. iii. 28.

ⁱ iii. 13.

156 POSTSCRIPT.

the Redemption of fallen Man than *Adam* himself had. Yet it is certain, that if the *Law*, when it said, *He who keeps these Statutes and Judgments shall live in them*, meant for ever, it proposed the Redemption of Mankind as certainly as the blessed *Jesus* himself did, when he said, *he that believeth in me shall have everlasting Life*. This becomes demonstrably clear if *St. Paul's* Reasoning will hold, who surely had heard nothing of this *Prerogative* of the *Law*, when he said, *If there had been a LAW given which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law*. Where observe, I pray you, the Force of the Word *ζωοποιῆσαι*, which signifies to *quicken*, or to *make alive*; plainly intimating, the same he had said in the Place before quoted, that those in Subjection to the *Law* were under a *Curse*, or in the State of *Death*.—Let me add only this further Observation, that if (as the Objector pretends) by *Life* in the Text of *Levit.* be meant *eternal Life*; and if (as the Apostle pretends) by *Life*, in the Text of *Habakkuk* be meant *eternal Life*; then will *Moses* and *Habakkuk* be made directly to contradict one another; the First giving *eternal Life* to *Works*; the Latter, to *Faith*.

But the Objector would insinuate, that *Jesus* himself seems to have fixed this Sense to the Text in *Leviticus*; at least that he has plainly inferred, that eternal Life was taught, if not obtain'd, by the *Law*. — “ When the Lawyer
“ in the Gospel (says he) had made that most
“ important Demand, *Master, what shall I do*
“ *to inherit eternal Life* *? our blessed Lord
“ refers him to what was written in the *Law*, and

* Luke x. 25.

“ upon

“ upon his making a sound and judicious Answer,
 “ approves of it; and for Satisfaction to his Que-
 “ stion, tells him, *This do and thou shalt live.*”
 Would not any one now conclude from the Sense
 here put upon the Words of *Jesus*, that the *sound*
and judicious Answer of the Lawyer must have
 been a Quotation of the Text in *Leviticus*, or at least
 some *general* Promise made to the Observers of the
whole Law of *Moses*? Nothing like it. On the
 contrary, the Lawyer's Answer was a Quotation of
 only one Precept of the Law, *Thou shalt love the Lord*
thy God with all thy Heart, &c. and thy Neighbour
as thy self. Now how much soever we may
 differ about a future Life's being held out by
 the *Law* through a Messiah that was to come, I
 suppose we are both agreed that *Faith in the Mes-*
siab, either actual or imputed, is necessary to ob-
 tain this future Life. There are but two ways
 then of understanding this Text of *St. Luke*, nei-
 ther of which is to his Purpose. The first is
 supposing *Jesus* included *Faith in himself* in this
 Precept of *loving God with all the Heart, &c.*
 which will appear no forced Interpretation to him
 who holds *Jesus* to be *really and truly God*; as I
 suppose we both do; and may be supported by a
 Circumstance in the Story, as told by *St. Matthew*¹,
 tho' omitted by *St. Luke*, which is *Jesus's* saying,
that on these two Commandments hang all the Law
and the PROPHETS. The second and exacter In-
 terpretation is, that *Jesus* spoke to a professing
 Follower, who pretended to acknowledge his *Mis-*
sion, and wanted only a *Rule of Life.* For *Jesus*
 is here preaching the Gospel to his *Disciples*, and
 a Lawyer stood up and tempted him, that is, on

¹ Matt. xxii. 40.

158 POSTSCRIPT.

the false footing of a Disciple required a Rule of Life. Now in either Case, this Reference of *Jesus* to the Law must imply this, and this only, *that without Righteousness and Holiness no Man shall see the Lord.* A Point in which, I suppose, we are agreed.—But still the Objector will say that these Words of *Jesus* allude to the Words of *Moses*. Admit they do. It will not follow, as he seems to think, that they were given to *explain* them. How many Allusions are there in the *New Testament* to Passages in the *Old*, accommodated to a *spiritual* Sense, where the Texts alluded to are seen, by all but Fanatics, to have only a *carnal*? And even in this very Allusion, if it be one, we find that the Promise made to the Observers of the whole Law, is *transferred* to the Observance of one single Precept in the *moral Part* of it. But let us grant him all he would have; and admit that these Words of *Jesus* were given to *explain* the Words of *Moses*. What would follow from thence, but that the Promise in *Leviticus* was *prophetical*, and had a *secondary* Sense, of a spiritual and sublimer Import? Will this give any Advantage to our Adversaries? surely none at all. And yet the Abuse of this Concession is all they have for it, to support their Systems. Thus the Reader has seen how the *Examiner* of the *second Proposition* triumphs on my Assertion, *that the later Jews excogitated the Doctrine of the Resurrection from the prophetic Language of former Ages*; and asks (with an Ignorance excusable only in a Savage to his Catechist) how *these Jews* came to be more quick sighted than *those* contemporary with the Prophets? I had in vain endeavoured to teach him that a *Carnal* and a *Spiritual* Sense, (both of which, we are agreed, the Law had, in order to

fit

fit *God's Word* to the use of *two* Dispensations) implied an *Ignorance* of the *Spiritual* Sense during the *first* of them. But my *Word* ought to go for nothing, in this Case, when unsupported by Scripture. Let us hear then what the Apostles themselves say to this matter: Who, in order to shew the superior Excellence of the *Gospel*, in their Reasoning against *Jews* and judaizing Christians, set the *Law* in Contrast to it, under the Titles of *The Law of a carnal Commandment*; *The Ministration of Death*; *The Law of Works*: and call Subjection to it, *Subjection to the Flesh*. Yet these very Writers at the same time own that *the Law was SPIRITUAL*, or had a *spiritual Sense*. But if by this they meant, that *that Sense* was generally understood during the *Law Dispensation*, their whole Argument had ended in the highest Futility. For then it was not a *Law of a carnal Commandment*, a *Ministration of Death*; but, indeed a *Law of the Spirit*, a *Ministration of Life*; only under a dead and carnal Cover; which, being clearly seen through, was no other than a Foil to set it the better off: and consequently was of equal Dignity, and, tho' not of equal Simplicity, yet, indeed, essentially the same with the *Gospel*. Thus we see into how high a Degree of Contempt with Unbelievers, these Principles of my Adversaries would naturally bring the holy Apostles, did not those admirable Reasoners take care themselves to guard against so horrid a Perversion of their Meaning. They owned, we see, that the *Law* had a *spiritual Sense*: But *when*, and by whom *discovered*, the Apostle *Paul* informs us, by calling

calling *that* Sense the NEWNESS OF SPIRIT^l; which he opposes to *the Oldness of the Letter*, that is, the *Letter* of the *Law*. In the former Part of the Verse, he speaks of the *Law being dead*; and, here, of its being *revived* again with a *new Spirit*, in Contradistinction to the *Oldness of the Letter*. So true was it, what, in another Place, he observes, that *the Law was a SHADOW of Things to come*; but *the BODY was of Christ*^m. The *Shadow* not of a *Body* then to be seen or understood, as our Adversaries imagine, but of a *Body that was to come*, and, by it's Presence, explain the Meaning and Reason of the *Shadow*. For the *Jews* being, as the Apostle says, *in Bondage under the Elements of the World*ⁿ, were as Men shut up in Prison, with their Faces kept turned from the Light, towards the whited Wall of Ceremonies: on which indeed they saw many *Shadows*; but the *Body* or opposite Substance at their Backs, to which they could not turn, they saw not. And in this State, says the same Apostle, they were *kept shut up unto the Faith, which should afterwards be revealed*^o. Till *that time* therefore, it appears that the *Body* of the *Jews* had no Knowledge of this *Faith*; one of the essential Articles of which is *Life everlasting*. This we must needs have concluded even tho' he had not said that till *that time* they were *in Bondage under the Elements of the World*. A proper Character truly of a People acquainted with the *reveal'd* Doctrine of *Life and Immortality*!

But, as the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is so much insisted on by my Adversaries, I shall, in the last

^l Rom. vii. 6.
^o Gal. iii. 23.

^m Col. ii. 17.

ⁿ Gal. iv. 3.

P O S T S C R I P T. 161

Place, produce a Text or two from it sufficient alone to determine the Controversy between us; and to justify what I said of it in the *Divine Legation*, that in this Epistle there are more express Declarations that Life and Immortality was not taught by nor known under the Law, than in all the other Books of the New Testament. For which indeed a very good Reason may be given; as it was addressed solely to the Jews; amongst whom this fatal Prejudice, that a future State was taught by the Law, was then, and has continued ever since, to be the strongest Impediment to their Conversion. But to come to the Point. The inspired Writer, in the second Chapter and second Verse, hath these remarkable Words, *For if the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and every Transgression and Disobedience received a just Recompence of Reward; how shall we escape, &c.* By the Word spoken by Angels every one knows is meant the Law delivered to Moses by them for his People: So that here is an express Declaration, 1. That the Sanctions of this Law were of a temporal kind. He then goes on, Verse the fifth, *For unto the Angels hath he not put in Subjection the World to come, whereof we speak.* And this is as express a Declaration, 2. That the Law taught no future State. Thus far then we are got. Let us next attend to the fourteenth and fifteenth Verses, *he [Christ] also himself likewise took Part of the same [Flesh and Blood] that, through Death, he might destroy him that had the Power of Death, that is, the Devil; and deliver them who, through Fear of Death, were all their Life-time subject to Bondage.* The Devil is here said to have the Power of Death, as he brought it in by the Delusion of the first Man; therefore

Y before

before Death can be abolished, he must be destroyed. But his Destruction is the Work of the *second Man*. Till then, we infer from hence, that Death reigned under the Devil. But this is not all; we are expressly told, that the *Jews, all their Life-time, were through Fear of Death subject to Bondage*. Which certainly can imply no other than, 3. *That they had no future State* to secure them from this Fear. See here then, for a Conclusion, the Principle of the *Divine Legation* justified on the plainest and most consequential Reasoning of the holy Apostle.

But now, say these Men, if the early *Jews* had no Knowledge of a Future State, the chosen People of God were in a much worse Condition than the Gentiles who all had it.—To this Purpose let us hear our anonymous *Examiner*, who has not only spoken the full Sense of his Party, but has urged it too with a Candour peculiar to himself.

“ You consider (says he) the Ignorance of the
 “ *Jews* as to the Doctrine of a future State, as
 “ one of the most *momentous Truths* that Religion has to boast of. I, on the other hand,
 “ look upon it as a DISGRACE to Revelation;
 “ as, by the very Act of God himself, it shuts out
 “ his own chosen People, for many Ages, from
 “ that single Point of Knowledge, which could
 “ be the Foundation of a reasonable Worship;
 “ while by the Directions of his Providence, all
 “ the World besides were permitted to have the
 “ Benefit of it P.

He says, *He looks upon no future State amongst the Jews as a Disgrace to Revelation*. Why so?

POSTSCRIPT. 163

Because by the very Act of God himself it shut out his own chosen People, &c. Sure he has forgot what he so oft told his Reader, that Moses taught not, nor had it in his Commission to teach, a future State to the Israelites: Otherwise he would have seen that this, alone, went a great way towards shutting out the chosen People. And if they were let in at all, it certainly was not by this Prophet of God. Consequently, if the holding, that God shut them out, be disgraceful to Revelation, this very orthodox Gentleman, we see, is got as deep in the Mire as the Author of the Divine Legation. In truth I pity the poor Man, who thus, at every Step, brings himself into these Distresses: And all, from a false Modesty. He was ashamed of the Absurdity of his Party, in holding that Moses taught, or ought to have taught, a future State; and therefore, at this turn, leaves them in the lurch, and takes up the better Principle of his Adversary, that Moses had no Commission to teach it: For he must have been dull indeed not to have collected that this was his Adversary's Principle, after he had seen him write a Book to prove that Moses did not teach it.—And be not offended, good Sir, that I call this a false Modesty; for what is it else, to be shocked with one Absurdity in your Party, and yet to defend all the rest? Whose only plausible Support, too, happens to be in that one which you reject. Indeed, indeed, my kind Friend,

——— *Pudor te malus urget,
Insanos qui inter vereare insanus haberi.*

—But the Cause, tho' not the Advocate, demands a serious Confutation. And as the only Support of it, against the *Argument* of the *Divine Legation*,

tion, lies in these calumnious Appeals to vulgar Prejudices; which our *Anonymus*, in the Passage above, has inforced with his heartiest Malice; I will here, once for all, examine their Pretensions: and so as they shall never henceforward be considered, in the learned World at least, as any other than mere vulgar Prejudices.

To begin then with the *Subject* of the *first* Proposition, That *God shut out the Israelites from the Knowledge of a future State*; which (in the Case given) is throwing that upon *God* for which *Man* only is accountable. The *Israelites* were indeed *shut out*; yet, not as he dreams, by the very *Act of God himself*; but, if he will have the Truth who never seeks it as he ought, by the very *Act of their Forefather, Adam*. It was the *first Man* who *shut them out*: And the Door of Paradise was never opened again till the coming of the *second Man, the Lord from Heaven*. But this, I own, is answering him in a strange Language; the Language of Scripture. A Language his Systems will never enable him to understand.—But more of this Secret, for such, I find, it is to our *Examiner*, in my next Volume.

But, to shew what infinite Loss they sustained in this Exclusion, he goes on, and says, that a *future State is the single Point of Knowledge which can be the Foundation of a reasonable Worship*. Here, Doctors differ. St. PAUL places the *Foundation of a reasonable Worship* in another Thing. He saith, that HE THAT COMETH TO GOD MUST BELIEVE THAT HE IS, AND THAT HE IS A REWARDER OF THEM THAT DILIGENTLY SEEK HIM ⁹. What is Man's

⁹ Heb. xi. 6.

P O S T S C R I P T. 165

Purpose in *coming to God*? Why, certainly, to *worship* him. And what doth the Apostle tell us is the true, the *reasonable Foundation of this Worship*? Why, to *believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him*. What becomes then of our *Examiner's only Foundation of a reasonable Worship*? The Apostle, we see, places it in the *Nature*, and not (as our *Examiner*) in the *inessential Circumstances*, of *Reward*: Consequently a *Reward given here*, was as true a *Foundation of reasonable Worship* to the early *Jews*, living under an *extraordinary Providence*, as a *Reward given hereafter* is to us *Christians*, living under an *ordinary one*: And consequently our *Examiner* must have been mistaken, when he made a *FUTURE STATE* the *single Point of Knowledge which can be the Foundation of a reasonable Worship*.—But does not *common Sense* say the same thing?

For to come a little closer to this formidable Man, now I have got an Apostle on my Side; I will undertake to *demonstrate*, (how much soever he dislikes the Word) that a *FUTURE STATE* is so far from being *the only Foundation of a reasonable Worship*, that, while *God is believed the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him*, (and that is the Case of a People under an *extraordinary Providence*) the *Ignorance of a future State* neither affects *Piety* nor *Morality*; the two things which constitute a *reasonable Worship*, and perfect Mankind in *Virtue*.

Not *Piety*, because that (in the Case given) depends solely on the *Belief that God is*.

Not *Morality*, because that depends solely on the *Knowledge of what God commands*.

And this, which *right Reason* teaches, the *Law of Moses* has promulged. We are commanded to
love

166 POSTSCRIPT.

love God for his Sake, that is for the Excellence of his Nature, the most lovely of all Objects. We are commanded to *love our Neighbour*; and the prescribed Measure, *as our selves*, points to the Equity of the Command; for being all equal by Nature we should have but one Rule of acting, for our selves and others. This is resolvable into the natural Relations of things; and those *Relations* are the *Declarations* of God's *Will*, the only true Foundation of Morality; and, as such, perpetually enforced by the *Law of Moses*. Thus firmly established are the Duties of the first and second Table. Now, *on the Love of God and of our Neighbour hang all the Law and the Prophets*. That these therefore should not be able at the same time to support a *Reasonable Worship*, when, to all this *Mosaic* Enforcement of the *Belief that God is*, it is added, that he is an exact *Rewarder of them that diligently seek him*, would be a very hard Case indeed; especially if we consider, that, to our corrupt Nature, it is not the immeasurable Reward at Distance, but that which is present, and understood by us, that most forcibly attracts us. And this it was, which the *Law of Moses* held out.

In a Word then, since *pure Virtue*, under which Term I comprise *Piety* and *Morality*, consists in acting agreeably to those Relations in which we stand to all Beings whatsoever; is it possible there can be any more forcible Inducement to our *reasonable Nature* for the Practice of it, than that which is proposed by the *Law of Moses*, namely, that God commands it out of our Love and Fear and Duty towards him? Or any more forcible Inducement to our *corrupt Nature*, than that eve-

ry Work shall receive its full Recompence of Reward, thro' the Administration of an *extraordinary* Providence? How then is it possible that a *long*, or *short Duration*; the Rewards of *this*, or of *another* Life, should in the least *essentially* affect the Purity, or Integrity of human Virtue, so taught and recommended; that is, a *reasonable Worship*, in the *Spirit* of Piety, and *Truth* of Morality?

To suppose that Virtue cannot be pure and perfect but when forced upon Men by the Immensity of Punishment, is having no better an Idea of it than the Pagan Slave in the Poet,

Sum bonus ac frugi : renuit negitatque Sabellus.

Indeed, in the *ordinary* Distribution of Things, where the Rewards and Punishments of Religion lie at distance, I believe nothing less than the Promises and Terrors of the *Christian* would be, generally, sufficient to support the Practice it enjoins. But here too, it is still the Love and Fear of *God*, not of *Reward* and *Punishment*, that are held out to us, to perfect and sublime our Virtue; though the *others* likewise be laid before us to raise and quicken it.

But here, let me not be again misunderstood, as I have been once already, by this super-subtile *Examiner*. I deny indeed that the Want of a future State in the *Jewish* Religion, under an *extraordinary* Providence, could at all affect the Truth and Purity of human Virtue, as there founded and enforced: Yet, at the same time, I am very far from denying but that other Things did hinder that Religion from being perfect. Nay, in my Address to the *Jews*^f, prefixed to the se-

^f *Ded. to the Jews*, p. xxii.

cond Volume of the *Divine Legation*, I have shewn what these Things were : As, first, *the whole Turn of their Ritual Law* : And, secondly, *the Want of a future State under the ordinary and common Providence of Mankind*^t. For I am there applying, to these mistaken People, a View of *Moses's Religion* as it appears under their present Condition, in order to convince them of the Necessity of having its Imperfection supplied by the Religion of *Jesus* ; in which, I suppose, all Christians are agreed. At least, as many as are out of the thick Darkness of Controversy will see these to be very different and distinct Positions. The one saying, that their Virtue might be pure and perfect, *during the Times of an extraordinary Providence*, for any thing that the Ignorance of a future State could affect to the contrary. The other, that a Religion without a future State, on the Supposition of its being to serve *for all Times*, must be very imperfect.

I might now expect, after so full a Confutation of this erroneous Opinion, concerning *the Foundation of a reasonable Worship*, that our Examiner should blush for his Rashness in asserting, that *the Ignorance of the Jews concerning a future State is a DISGRACE to Revelation*. An Expression, which, were there but a Chance of his being wrong, a sober Divine would carefully have avoided ; as altogether unsuitable to that Reverence we owe to God, while measuring his tremendous Providence by *our* scanty and uncertain Ideas of *fit and right*. I might say, indeed, that the *Jews'* Ignorance of a future State was a Truth of *so high Importance*, that, from thence, could be de-

^t Page xxiii.

monstrated the Divinity of their Dispensation ; and I presume without Offence to any sober Man ; because, if I were mistaken, no Injury was done to Revelation ; I left it whole and entire, just as I took it up. But should the *Examiner* be mistaken, his calling this Ignorance a DISGRACE TO REVELATION would be affording such an Handle to the Enemies of Religion to blaspheme, as he should tremble to think of.

But, if I know him well, he is not a Writer of *Retractions*. He has another Reason for calling it a *Disgrace to Revelation*. For, *It shuts up* (he says) *God's own chosen People from a future State, while by the Directions of his Providence all the World besides were permitted to have the Benefit of it.* And now, good People, you have it all : And if this will not move you, why — The Author of the *Divine Legation*, for any thing I see, may go on.

This *second* Proposition we see is, that (in the Case given) “ all the Pagan World were by the “ divine Providence *permitted* to enjoy a *Benefit* “ which was denied to the *Jews*.” Examining the *Predicate* of this Proposition, we shall first consider the PERMISSION, and then the BENEFIT.

All the World besides, says he, *were permitted.*

— By what Instrument ? By the Use of their Reason. — And had not the *Jews* the Use of theirs ? Not the *free* Use : For their Prophet delivering to them, from God, a new Law and Religion, in which the Doctrine of a future State was not found, this would naturally lead them to conclude against it. — What, in Defiance of all the Deductions of Reason, which, from God's demonstrable Attributes of Goodness and Justice, made the Pagan World conclude, that, as moral Good

170 POSTSCRIPT.

and Evil had not their Retribution *here*, they would have it *hereafter*? Yes indeed, so we find it was.—Strange! that this *Moses* should have such an Influence over a People's Understanding! Why, if you will have it, he promised that Good and Evil should have their Retribution *here*.—Ay, now the Secret is out. Well, indeed, might this *shut* them *up* from looking further; especially if (as you pretend to *believe*) he not only *promised*, but *performed*, likewise. See then to what this PERMISSION amounts, so invidiously urged, not against me, for that is nothing, but against the Scriptures of God. Just to thus much, “That *all the World besides* were permitted to find out, by *Reason*, what his own chosen People were taught, by the practical Demonstration of an *extraordinary Providence*; namely, that God would act with Justice and Goodness towards Man.”

Come we now to the *Benefit*. The Benefit of the Doctrine of a *future State* is twofold. To *Society as such*, as it is a Curb to *Vice* by supporting the Belief of a Providence, under the *unequal* Distribution of Things: And to *Religion, as such*, as it is an Incentive to *Virtue*, by shewing the Rate set upon it. The Doctrine of a *future State*, in the Pagan World, afforded indeed that *Benefit to Society*: But then, *that* Benefit the *Jewish State* did not want, as being under an *equal* Distribution of Things. *Benefit to Religion*, their *Doctrine* of a future State afforded none. It was over-run with Superstitions; and generally gave the Rewards of another Life not to *moral* but to *ritual* Observances. And when not so, as in the open teaching of the *Mysteries*, yet even there the severest Punishments in the Pagan Hell were allotted

lotted to the *Atheists*, or the Rejectors of the vulgar *Polytheism*; which, not only utterly depraved Religion, but riveted Men in its Depravity. So that, in the Sense of our *Examiner* (who is here speaking of the Benefit of a future State to Religion, *as such*) this *future State of all the World besides* was indeed no *Benefit* at all. But he will say, I have shewn, that the ἀπορρητὰ of the *Mysteries* removed these Errors. It is true, I have. But, at the same time, likewise, that these were revealed to very few. And, to set Matters even, has not he shewn from Bishop Bull^r, that the *hidden Mysteries of the Law were opened to fit Hearers, wherever they were found?* though, from the *total Silence* of a future State, in the old *Jewish History*, I suspect, *these were still fewer*. Which Opinion I will be ready to retract when he shall shew me, in the *Jewish Antiquities*, as plain Intimations of a *future State*, amongst the *hidden Mysteries of the Law*, as I have shewn him in the *Grecian*, of the Doctrine of the *Unity*, and the *Detection of vulgar Polytheism* amongst the *Mysteries of Paganism*. But had a future State afforded the *Pagans* never so much *Benefitto Religion as such*: Yet neither this did the *Jewish People* want, and for the same Reason as above, because they were under an *extraordinary Providence*. And now let us see to what the *BENEFIT* amounts.

The *Pagans had a future State* to support their Society and Religion.

But then, so circumstanced, that it was of Service to *Society* only, altho' *both* wanted it.

The *Jews had no future State* to support their Society and Religion.

But then, *neither* wanted it.

And now, I pray you. on which Side lies the Ballance of the *Benefit*? We commonly hear it said, that *seeing is believing*: but I suspect our Examiner has been imposed on by a very different Aphorism, as absurd in the Thought as the other is in the Expression, that *believing his having* a Principle not unworthy of his School. Else how comes he to place so great a *Benefit* in the Point in Question, if he did not suppose that the *Jews* want of the *Doctrine* deprived them of the *Thing*?

But have I not been reckoning all this Time without my Host, while I argued against these silly Prejudices, upon the Confession of an *extraordinary Providence*? For, disputing here with *Christian Men*, I have *supposed* that they *believed* such a Dispensation. And prudent was it in me so to do. For had I been called upon to prove my *Supposition*, I do not know whether what I could say would have satisfied the judicious Reader, who had observed that all the Arguments they use against me receive the little Force they have on a *contrary Supposition*. And even this *private Letter-writer*, one of the most candid of his kind, had still a Reason in reserve, to prove why the Promise of *Life* in his favourite Text of *Leviticus*, must needs mean *eternal Life*, and not *temporal* only, which looks very much that way; it is, *because the best Men* (he says) *were often cut off in the midst of their Days, and frequently suffered greater Adversities than the most profligate Sinners*. Who now that had even a Mind to let us see he believed nothing of the Matter, could have expressed his Meaning in stronger or more significant Terms? I am not ashamed to confess I read my Bible; and believed what it
told

P O S T S C R I P T. 173

told me of this *extraordinary Providence*; and, in the Simplicity of my Heart, would needs try if I could make the Deist believe too. I found it was this that most revolted him: and therefore undertook to prove, from the very Constitution of their Oeconomy, that the *Representation* must needs be true, and so, while I was removing his *Objections* to Revelation, give him a Demonstration of its *Truth*. In the mean time, I little suspected that a Set of Men, who call themselves Believers, would for the Sake only of combating the *Medium* of my Demonstration, ever venture to call in Question that very Fact for which I was contending with *their* Adversaries; and in a way their Adversaries (except it were perhaps *Spinoza* and his Man *Toland*) had never attempted, namely, by a virtual Denial of the *Representation*. If this was to be contested me, I could have wished, for the Honour of *Revelation*, it had been done by the professed Enemies of it: And then I could have exposed their *Prevarication* without much Regret. As it is, I rather chuse to draw a Veil over this *Infirmity of the Flesh*; AND WAIT FOR *the Renewal of a right Spirit within them*.

F I N I S.

**BOOKS printed by the same Author, and sold
by J. and P. Knapton in Ludgate-Street.**

THE DIVINE LEGATION of *Moses* demonstrated, on the Principles of a Religious Deist, from the Omission of the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments in the *Jewish* Dispensation. In Nine Books. Vol. I. The third Edition. 1742.

———Vol. II. in two Parts, the second Edition: With an Appendix, Containing some Remarks on a Book, entitled, *Future Rewards and Punishments believed by the Ancients*, &c. With a Postscript to the Author of the *Principles and Connexion of Natural and Revealed Religion*. And a Letter to the Right Reverend Dr. Richard Smallbrook, Lord Bishop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*. 1742.

The Alliance between Church and State: Or, the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test-Law demonstrated, from the Essence and End of Civil Society, upon the fundamental Principles of the Law of Nature and Nations. In three Books. The first, treating of a Civil and Religious Society. The second, of an Established Church: And the third, of a Test-Law. The second Edition. 1741.

A Vindication of the Author of *The Divine Legation of Moses*, &c. from the Aspersions of the Country Clergyman's Letter in the *Weekly Miscellany* of February 24, 1737.

Faith working by Charity to Christian Edification: A Sermon preached at the last Episcopal Visitation for Confirmation in the Diocese of *Lincoln*. With a PREFACE, shewing the Reasons of its Publication; and a POSTSCRIPT, occasioned by some Letters lately published in the *Weekly Miscellany*. 1738.

A Sermon preached at the Abbey-Church at *Bath*, for promoting the Charity and Subscription towards the General Hospital or Infirmary in that City; on *Sunday, October 24, 1742*. Published at the Request of the Governors of the said Hospital. To which is added, a short Account of the Nature, Rise, and Progress of the General Infirmary at *Bath*.

A Critical and Philosophical Commentary on Mr. *Pope's* Essay on Man. In which is contained a Vindication of the said Essay from the Misrepresentations of Mr. *De Resnel*, the *French* Translator, and of Mr. *De Crousaz*, Professor of Philosophy and Mathematicks in the Academy of *Lausanne*, the Commentator.

**BOOKS printed for J. and P. Knapton at the
Crown in Ludgate-Street.**

THE Works of *Samuel Clarke*, D. D. late Rector of *St. James's Westminster*. Beautifully printed in four Volumes Folio.

Sermons on several Subjects, by *Samuel Clarke*, D. D. late Rector of *St. James's Westminster*. Published from the Author's Manuscript by *John Clarke*, D. D. Dean of *Sarum*. With a Preface, giving some Account of the Life, Writings, and Character of the Author. By *Benjamin*, Lord Bishop of *Winchester*. In Ten Volumes, 8vo. The Sixth Edition.

The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature. To which are added, Two brief Dissertations, I. Of Personal Identity. II. Of the Nature of Virtue. By *Joseph* Lord Bishop of *Bristol*. The Second Edition, 8vo.

Fifteen Sermons preached at the *Rolls Chapel* upon the following Subjects. Upon Human Nature. Upon the Government of the Tongue. Upon Compassion. Upon the Character of *Balaam*. Upon Resentment. Upon Forgiveness of Injuries. Upon Self-Deceit. Upon the Love of our Neighbour. Upon the Love of God. Upon the Ignorance of Man. By *Joseph* Lord Bishop of *Bristol*.

The Heads of Illustrious Persons of *Great Britain*, engraven by Mr. *Houbraken* and Mr. *Vertue*, with their Lives and Characters. By *Thomas Birch*, A. M. F. R. S. Beautifully printed on large Imperial Paper. In one Volume Folio.

The History of *England*, by Mr. *Rapin de Thoyras*. Translated into *English*, with additional Notes, by *N. Tindal*, M. A. Rector of *Alverstoke* in *Hampshire*. In Two Volumes in Folio. The Third Edition. Illustrated with Maps and Genealogical Tables, the Heads of the Kings, the Sovereign Queens, and some of the most illustrious Princes of the Royal Family, engraven by Mr. *Vertue*; and the Monuments of the Kings, with their Epitaphs and Inscriptions; on seventy Folio Copper-Plates. Also twenty three small historical Copper Plates at the beginning of the several Books. Price 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* in Sheets.

The Works of *Alexander Pope*, Esq; 11 vols. 8vo.
Selecta Poemata Itatorum qui Latine scripserunt. Cur-
cujusdam Anonymi Anno 1684. congesta, iterum in lu-
cem data, una cum aliorum Itatorum operibus. Acu-
rante *A. Pope*. 2 Vol. pret. 6 s.

Precedents in Conveyancing settled and approved by
Gilbert Horsman, late of *Lincoln's Inn*, Esq; and other
eminent Counsel. Containing Conveyances and Settle-
ments, not only of Estates Real and Personal, known to
former Times, but also of Stocks, Bonds, and Annuities
of the publick Companies, Exchequer Annuities, For-
tunes in *Ireland* and *Holland*, and Plantations in *America*;
likewise many new Clauses and Provisions in Conse-
quence of Acts of Parliament, and of Determinations in
the Courts of Justice. In three Volumes Folio. With
proper Tables.

The Commentaries upon the Aphorisms of Dr. *Her-
man Boerhaave*, the late learned Professor of Physick in
the Univerſity of *Leyden*, concerning the Knowledge
and Cure of the several Diseases incident to human Bo-
dies. By *Gerrard Van Swieten*, M. D. Translated into
English. Vol. I. and II.

Mr. *Rollin's* antient History of the *Egyptians*, *Car-
thaginians*, *Affyrians*, *Babylonians*, *Medes* and *Persians*,
Macedonians and *Grecians*. Translated from the *French*.
In ten Volumes in 12mo. with Frontispieces beautifully
engraven, a Chronological Table, and copious Index.

Mr. *Rollin's* History of the Arts and Sciences of the
Ancients, illustrated with fifty Copper Plates. In 4 vol.
8vo.

The *Roman* History, from the Foundation of *Rome* to
the end of the Commonwealth. By Mr. *Rollin*, 8vo.

Quintiliani Institutionum Oratoriarum Libri XII. ad
usum Scholarum accommodati, recis quæ minus neces-
saria visa sunt, & brevibus notis illustrati; à *Carolo Rol-
lin*, 8vo.

The Manners and Customs of the *Romans*. I. Of their
Manners in private Life, their Habits, Ornaments, Build-
ings, Chariots, Feasts, &c. II. Of their different kinds
of Government and Magistrates. III. Of the Revenues
and Forces of the State; and of War. IV. Of their Re-
ligion and Shews, and Customs observed in them. Trans-
lated from the *French*, 8vo. pr. 5 s.